

SENATE—Monday, April 25, 1983

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1983)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in adjournment until 2 p.m., Tuesday, April 26, 1983.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M.,
TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1983

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 12 seconds p.m.), the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 26, 1983, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 25, 1983

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 21, 1983.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, April 25, 1983.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, from whom comes every good gift, give us awareness of the needs of those about us, that we may truly be friends and colleagues. Encourage us to offer support to those who feel alive and to give strength to those who are troubled. Help us to speak words of consolation and peace to every person and always be available to listen and hear the concerns of others. Surround us, O God, with Your love, that we may reach out in deeds of friendship and grace to those near and dear to us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to correct Public Law 98-8 due to errors in the enrollment of H.R. 1718; and

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Wednesday, April 27, 1983, to receive a message from the President of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating the week of November 20, 1983 through November 26, 1983, as "National Family Week";

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 24 through April 30, 1983, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate October 16, 1983, as "World Food Day"; and

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution designating November 1983 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

NEGOTIATIONS FOR LONG-TERM GRAIN AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET UNION

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on frequent occasions I have come down to the well criticizing the President and the administration for a variety of issues, most repeatedly on farm issues. But today I come down to the well to give the President some congratulations, and perhaps providing a little positive reinforcement for announcing on Friday that he intends to enter into negotiations for a long-term grain agreement with the Soviet Union.

Clearly, he has responded finally to the repeated urgings of myself and other Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle to seek a new long-term agreement. Clearly, he has decided that his earlier decision not to seek a new long-term agreement was prompted by the imposition of martial law, but that has failed to achieve meaningful results. I am hopeful that, in fact, a substantive long-term agreement can be reached.

The President going down to Florida and calling the Soviet Union an evil empire, while it may be true, does not particularly provide an incentive for the Soviets to agree to buy large quantities of American grain and other agricultural products, but for once, I think the President has responded appropriately. The Department of Agriculture has won out over the Department of State, and it is time to give our farmers the kind of encouragement they need so they know there will be long-term sales of grain in the future.

"RACIST INVESTMENT" BAN GETS INITIAL ARIZONA HOUSE APPROVAL

(Mr. McNULTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of this House a recent action by the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona expressing the concern of the people of the State of Arizona on continuing racial injustice in the country of the Republic of South Africa. The sponsor of the bill, Representative David Bartlett of Tucson, says that it is intended to send a message to the Government of that country "about the principles we hold * * *. It is appropriate * * * to say we are not going to support apartheid."

If enacted, this legislation will prohibit State retirement funds from being invested in South African companies.

I congratulate the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona in forwarding the principle of racial equity and justice, a principle denied in daily life of South African society.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the Record, "Racist Investment" Ban Gets Initial House OK" from the Arizona Republic, Thursday, April 12, 1983:

"RACIST INVESTMENT" BAN GETS INITIAL HOUSE OK

(By Keven Ann Willey)

Legislation prohibiting state retirement funds from being invested in South African companies was given tentative approval Monday by the Arizona House 23-22.

Tacked onto a measure allowing the State Retirement System to invest in foreign securities, the measure would ban investments in South African companies because of South Africa's policy of apartheid, or racial segregation.

"I think it's important . . . to send a message about the priorities we hold," said the amendment's sponsor, Rep. David Bartlett, D-Tucson. "It is appropriate for this state to say we are not going to support apartheid."

There was no debate on the amendment or the bill, although a similar amendment touched off a skirmish between House Democratic Leader Art Hamilton and House Republican Leader Burton Barr last week when it was defeated in a House committee.

"It is not something that employees, at least of my hue, would like to see," Hamilton, who is black said last week, referring to the idea of investing public money in a nation that has government-sanctioned segregation.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Barr had come in late for the committee vote and joined other Republicans in defeating the amendment. Later, he told reporters the amendment caught him by surprise and that he would support such an amendment on the House floor.

When lawmakers were asked Monday to stand for a head count on the amendment, it was 22-22. Hamilton, who presided over the House debate, cast the deciding vote to pass the amendment.

Barr was not present for the tentative floor vote.

The amendment version of Senate Bill 1154, which supporters say would not prohibit investment in U.S. companies in South Africa, is expected to be formally approved today and sent to the Senate. Bartlett said after the vote that he would have preferred to include an investment ban on U.S. companies doing business in South Africa but feared the stronger version would be defeated.

REPEAL OF PRISON INDUSTRIES AMENDMENT TO SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

(Mr. KINDNESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend section 114(b) of title 23, United States Code, which prohibits the use of materials produced by convict labor in construction of federally subsidized highways. The effect of this provision, which was an amendment to the Surface Transportation Act adopted during the final hours of the 97th Congress without the benefit of hearings, is far reaching. It would effectively shut down a 30-year-old prison industry that has been operating successfully in 37 States.

The American Correctional Association recently conducted a study on the impact which this amendment would have on prison industries in the various States. The ACA study concludes that in all 50 States combined, the amendment would result in: First, idle capital costs of \$7,979,957; second, inventory loss of \$10,661,618; third, other costs of \$3,773,444; and fourth, the need to reassign 774 inmates out of the 976 inmates currently employed in the industry. Certainly, an amendment of this magnitude should have been the subject of careful study and debate, which unfortunately, it was not.

On February 24, 1983, Alan Breed, the director of the National Institute of Corrections, specifically addressed this amendment in his testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice during its 2 days of oversight hearings on corrections. Mr. Breed testified that:

Perhaps our greatest help could be to assure that we at the Federal level do not make matters worse (at the State and local levels).

Mr. Breed then went on to highlight the amendment to the Surface Transportation Act as a prime example of how the Federal Government has made matters worse for the States.

During his tenure in the Federal judiciary Chief Justice Warren Burger has spoken often on the subject of correctional institutions and the policies and practices which ought to be changed. In one of his recent speeches on corrections delivered on December 16, 1981, to the Lincoln, Nebr., Bar Association, the Chief Justice maintains that prisons be made places for basic education and vocational training. The Chief Justice argues, and I agree, that—

It is predictable that a person confined in a penal institution for 2, 3, or more years who is then released without being able to read, write, spell or do simple arithmetic and not trained with any marketable skill will be vulnerable to returning to a life of crime.

Yet, rather than creating the opportunity for new prison industries to train inmates in a gainful occupation, we have instead, gone in reverse and summarily dismantled an existing 30-year-old prison industry that has worked well.

Due to the negative financial and administrative impact that the amendment in question would have on the States and eventually the taxpayers, I urge members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to give prompt and careful consideration to this legislation. Identical legislation, S. 693, was introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY on March 7, 1983.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1983

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, April 27, 1983.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT COMMENDED FOR APPROVING RUSSIAN GRAIN DEAL

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to respond to the President's change of statement of foreign policy on Friday. I am pleased that President Reagan has decided to approve the negotiation of a new long-term grain agreement with the Soviet Union.

This decision represents a fundamental and healthy change in the administration's approach to United States-Soviet relations. It creates opportunities for improved relations

with the Soviets in other areas. It is a move away from a policy of self-defeating belligerence to a dialog based on our national interests and mutual interests. It is a step away from a new cold war toward more constructive relations that may lead to an agreement to halt a senseless arms race that threatens the security of the American and Soviet people and that would drain hundreds of billions of dollars from the American and Soviet economies.

The President's decision will help restore a sense of reliability to commitments and contracts made by American exporters. It will help our farmers and workers in other industries to meet the foreign competition that is challenging our economy from all directions. After all, for every billion dollars of farm exports, 35,000 new jobs are created. This year alone, almost 1.3 million American jobs have been created by farm exports alone.

The President's decision is good news for the American farmer and the American economy. Our farmers deserve a fair chance to compete against the Europeans, the Argentines, the Australians, and others who have the advantage of substantial government subsidies and the further advantage of access to Soviet markets that have been denied to our people heretofore by the administration's previous policy.

Mr. Speaker, while I suspect the 1984 elections and the farm vote in the Midwest may have influenced the President's thinking, he has reached the right conclusion. I support his decision. It is good news for all Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 63, the vote on the Stratton amendment, as amended, to House Joint Resolution 13, I am shown as not voting. I was present during that vote and voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be included as a part of the Record in the permanent Record after rollcall No. 63.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1210

A LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG BANKING INTERESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to address the House, as I have on prior occasions, because I feel that there is a responsi-

bility of accountability on the part of banking and financial interests. Because of what I have said on a number of other occasions, I could say that I have importuned others—particularly those who do not agree—with the privileges known as the special order of the House of Representatives. I repeat that I rise only because I feel that the time is due for accountability.

I have had some written inquiries from fellow Americans from various States, who have been motivated to contact me because of the other times I have spoken here on issues that transcend the parochial and local and purely district issues that a Member of Congress represents. Many of those writing recently want to know why I have not continued to speak on a regular basis on the impeachment resolutions that I introduced in the last two Congresses with respect to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and others. They raise questions also about my legislation to bring about accountability on the part of this vastly powerful, runaway, oligarchal group or coterie of bankers that controls the economic and financial destinies of our people.

I think that the time has long been past when the Congress should have addressed itself to the fundamental issue as to who is going to dictate the policies governing economic, fiscal, and monetary matters. The Constitution says it should be the people—the men who founded this Nation intended it.

Even during the Continental Congress, it was obvious that this was the No. 1 issue.

Who is going to control the credit? Who is going to control the allocation of credit to manufacturing, industry, and small business?

As matters now stand, the Congress has all but completely abdicated this trust and responsibility, along with such vital issues as war and peace, although the Constitution says they must be determined by Congress. But decisions are being made in those tapestried, plush offices of the great lawyers for these international banking institutions and corporations. They are making decisions not on the basis of what is good for the greatest number and the greatest interests of the greatest number of the people in this country. What is being served by their decisions is their interests and their greed. Rampant, unrestrained greed has brought our Nation to its knees and destroyed hundreds of thousands of small businesses. They are going under at record numbers even now in this day of promised recovery, if not actual announced recovery.

Who is kidding who? We live in a skeptic's age. During the 30 years that I have had the privilege of serving in an elective public office, society has become cynical.

It seems that everybody has to have an angle. "I made mine, Jack. What are you up to?"

Most people think: You have to have an angle. If you get involved in conflict, if you raise an issue, they say, "Don't rock the boat. Let's go along. Just get along. Don't rock the boat. What is your angle? Are you doing this for political reasons?"

My only angle in raising the Federal Reserve Board issue is the need of the people to gain control of the monetary and fiscal policies of this Nation. As I have said before, the Federal Reserve Board is not an agency heaven-sent. Unfortunately, we have allowed the Federal Reserve to be considered like old John Adams once said of George Washington: "Sent from Heaven, booted, spurred, and ready to ride on the backs of hapless mankind."

Despite what it has done, simply put, the Federal Reserve Board is just a creature of the Congress. The Congress created the Federal Reserve Board. Yet in the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, of which I have been a member for 21 years, I have heard the endless litany that if you send the General Accounting Office to audit the Federal Reserve's books, you will wreck its independence.

Many members say: "We must maintain the independence of the Federal Reserve."

But my colleagues forget that the way the Federal Reserve operates today and has operated for some decades is not independence. It is a subjugation of the American peoples' right to have access on an equal basis to the great lines of credit that keep them alive, keep their wages stable, and keep the small business people alive.

□ 1220

Even during the days of Greek democracy, greed had to be restrained. There were laws against usury. No nation, no society, no body of people under any clime or climate, language, or social structure or governmental form has survived with extortionate, usurious thievery, known as legalized usury.

The Federal Reserve has legalized usury as high as 21-percent prime rate. What does prime rate mean, outside of the jargon of the bankers? It means this is what they treat themselves to, but even they have special categories. During the last decade in these massive manias for mergers, when you have great mega-corporations, billion plus and more entities gobbling each other up, the battle of the mastodons, not one job has been created. Yet these activities have tied up hundreds of billions of dollars of credit that should be available to the small businessman and is not; so today my little businessman in my city of San Antonio tells me last week, when he tried

to borrow \$2,000 or \$3,000, for what? So he could keep a meager inventory and keep him competitive. The bank wanted to charge him because it defined it as a consumer loan, not a business loan, 23 percent, at a time when our President says, "I have brought down interest rates."

Mr. Volcker, the Chairman, told us week before last in the committee, "Interest rates have gone down, except not as much as they ought to, but there is nothing we can do because we can't make the banks do it."

There is no reason for this incredible statement by the perpetrator of the act, that incredible statement to an almost impassive Congress or committee, it is incredible.

So I want to assure my colleagues and those who fear that maybe the fight is not going on, that I have reintroduced every one of the bills having to do with the reorganization of the Federal Reserve Board. I have reintroduced my impeachment resolutions. I have taken one step further in the process of proceeding along the impeachment procedural lines, as if the whole House were the Committee on the Judiciary, as I announced last session, and proceeded with three general bills of particulars, with an additional four specific bills of particulars or charges, because I am well versed in the history of the impeachment process, not only with regard to our country and its constitutional history, but to the mother country from which we draw our government and our inspiration for liberty, which I know America has improved upon like no country in the history of the world.

As I remind some of my friends, you know, after all, even in England, there is no first amendment. This is the big difference. This is what is at stake, believe it or not, because today, for example, and I am going to digress a little and I hope and I trust that I will not be accused of trying to put on like a Senator, Mr. Speaker. You know, there they have the untrammelled freedom of debate, unlimited debate, not as much as in the Texas State Senate, but certainly here, and I do not want anybody to think that I am putting on like a U.S. Senator, but this is my only opportunity and I do feel accountable for the words I utter.

I did not introduce impeachment resolutions for bombastic purposes or because it was some way to get publicity. As a matter of fact, it has not. Maybe it is best.

I have never been a determinant of what makes news. The newspapers do that. That is their business and whether they see anything newsworthy or not is for them to fathom, not for me; but I do feel accountable.

I feel that no man, whether he is an elected official, a member of a deliberative body, or an appointed official es-

pecially, or a private citizen, has the right to speak irresponsibly and unaccountably.

I stand behind every charge I have made, every word I have uttered and willing to be shown where I am wrong. That is why I went to the Judiciary Committee. That is where I want this matter of my impeachment resolution to be considered, and then my other two bills, they are for the reorganization, I hope that the distinguished chairman of the full committee, who has been another great stalwart in this battle of just trying to represent people, as soon as his subcommittee which has jurisdiction is not so pressed with the other emergency business now coming at us from every angle, that he will entertain the possibility of giving hearings on the specific measures I have been introducing off and on for about 18 years with respect to the reorganization and bringing about further accountability of the Federal Reserve Board.

I was going to digress a bit because earlier we had 1-minute speeches and we heard some of our colleagues, especially those representing the wheat-growing areas, the grain-growing areas, and others, talk about the wisdom of the President resuming some kind of real good agreement with the Russians; but now here is the President, who says the focus of all evil is Russia and the Russian leaders. He is the one that vitiated President Carter's embargo, whether that was good, bad, indifferent, wise or imprudent, I am not an expert, I do not know. All I know is that Mr. Carter was President.

Now we have another President who at the moment he assumed office undid that embargo. Now, whether his motives were political or not, that is not for me to judge; but I just want to bring to you the world's opinion, countries outside of our boundaries and what they think.

I do not worry a bit about the Russians. I worry more about ourselves. The Russians are not going to do us in. We will do ourselves in first before the Russians will, and particularly if we continue smugly and unconcerned as we are on these vital issues, trying to continue to brush them under the rug.

The Russians laugh because in the meanwhile the President has so much tried to compel our so-called European allies to join us in an embargo on industrial products or technological products to the Russians, when as a matter of fact the very main money supporters of the President, to whom he is first and foremost loyal, have already given all of that to Russia. The only reason the Russians can build a pipeline and enter into contracts with the German bankers, the French bankers and the English bankers and the Belgian bankers, is because our great industrialists have already made

it possible for them. We gave them not only the know-how, we gave them the material.

If communism, as demonstrated by the Russian experience has succeeded, it has succeeded only in those aspects where they have borrowed the American technique, and that goes back to the very first 5-year plan in the twenties; but nothing—nothing would have been possible unless and until first the bankers had made it possible.

The other day on one of the national networks it was to me one of the most historical and interesting interviews of David Rockefeller on his plane coming back from a trip where he had said, "Now, look here, boys, you know, not all the Communists are the same. There are some guys we can do business with. We don't want to get into trouble there. There are some of them we can do business with."

□ 1230

Then this reporter said, "Well, now, Mr. Rockefeller, but look here, just what do the bankers have to do? The government is, you mean to tell me, are you admitting that the bankers do have—"

He said, "Well, you know, come to think about it, governments can't do too much more than what their bankers will let them do." This is on national TV.

Now, I do not say that that is bad per se. What I am saying is that in light of what is at issue in our country, which is who is going to govern the destinies of the people's allocation of credits, the bankers or their representatives, the Government, the President, and the Congress. That is the issue. Then the rest follows in the way the world is structured today, just like after World War I, same issue.

I am just never, never surceased from amazement that we should be wallowing in this undeserved depression, this induced depression. This is not an act of God. This was induced by man actions and American leaders' actions, just the same road, almost, the same action. The only difference is the timing and the names of the individual statesmen, the names of the in-betweeners, that is the only difference from what we had after World War I. It is the same thing, no different.

America got into that shell game and lost. The Europeans have old governments, and particularly those aristocratic and excellent, excellent leaders, and then we have Americans who are so egotistical as to think they can outwit, like the billionaire Nelson Bunker Hunt, or Bunker Nelson Hunt, I do not know which goes first, my fellow Texan and billionaire from Texas, who thought that he was so smart that he could corner the silver market in competition with these guys in London off and on those financial streets where that is all they have

been doing for 400 years. And they call Uncle Sam, Uncle Sap. They did during and after World War I and they have not stopped to this day.

Yet we have the same Congressmen, the same President, almost, trying to generate a war psychosis on the one hand. So help me, if the Russians do not go crazy, some of them, just trying to figure us out, we can defeat them just by keeping on trying to run them crazy.

We had one Republican President that started détente and it started and took so good that the Germans and the Central Europeans still believe in it. That is why they are giving trouble to Mr. Reagan now. It took a Republican President. Here is a guy that when he was here he set the barn on fire, anti-communism, Communist "big devil," "bit demon," about to gobble us up, and he went and set the barn on fire. Then a few years later as President he comes around with the fire engines to put it out.

Let me tell you, I have had nothing but undying admiration for that kind of activity.

Now we have this President saying "Oh, no." Those same people that that President cheek and jowl toasted his vodka with, there is the focus of all evil. I would not trust them for anything. But yet, yet we are going to have to sit down and maybe we can bargain and maybe we can do this.

I do not know what the concept of any mentality in today's 1980's world with the world shrunk as it is, would have that kind of thinking. It is not quite clear and apparently very unsusceptible of interpretation by anybody.

Ours is an open society. The Russians are not that dumb. Do you know, you have some mighty intelligent Russians, believe it or not, Communist or not.

This is a thing that is causing our defeat: we ourselves.

What just aggravates me no end is to see that we have learned nothing. Now closer to our borders where we cannot afford the luxury of this continued indulgence in error and ignorance, if we ignore the history of Middle Europe and involve ourselves and, what is more do not even take into account the history in the Middle East where now the President, in my opinion, has actually violated the War Powers Limitation Act and has some 1,200 poor marines out there with an undetermined mission. When he was asked for how long, he said, "I do not know."

"Mr. President, what do you mean?" He said, "Well, that will depend on the Government of Lebanon."

I cannot imagine any President before this one that I have had the honor to work with in a sort ever, ever allowing that to enter into his statement. Our Marines, their mission undeclared, undefined. What is their mis-

sion in Beirut? Was it to protect the Embassy? It certainly must not have been.

What do you do if the next time a marine is killed, or 12, or 10, and God forbid, I do not know of anybody here that knows. We do not know. What is the status?

What is more, what about what is not mentioned at all, and that is our 1,500 airborne about 500 miles up on the Sinai that are there, fully equipped militarily. What is their mission?

Let me tell you the difference is that those were sent by this Congress. I was one of the few voices present on the floor and voiced my concern, criticism, and objection. That is why I feel I have the right to talk and ask these questions.

The banking situation is going to continue. I am going to press, and at a suitable time in which there would be a minimal of importuning the order of the House, like today, I will continue my efforts to bring a House vote on my resolution to impeach Paul Volcker as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, whether he is reappointed or not, for specific actions that under all standards and dimensions of definition of an impeachment purpose he should be confronting at least the committee. But, by golly, under the rules of the House, if I cannot gain that, then being that it is a resolution of high category, I will proceed and bring it at least to a chance where the Members, if they want to, can vote on it, vote it up, vote it out, shut me up, shut me out. But they are going to get it.

But not until I develop a case as if I were doing it with the committee or the committee was discharging its duty on this House floor. So I want to lay that to rest.

The other was that I have not spoken since the indictments of five individuals in the case of the murder and assassination of the only Federal judge in the history of our judiciary that was so killed. I had to speak over 35 times for almost 3 years before we could bring this to the level of consciousness to make sure that it was not swept into the dust of history like the Jimmy Hoffa case or like the other disturbing cases that reflect what I called this King Crime subjugation of the American people to its destructive rule.

I felt, and I think that I must acknowledge the fact, that the Director of the FBI, Judge Webster, called me all the way to San Antonio hours before the announcement of the indictments to let me know, and to thank me. The way he said it was, "you, more than anybody else, enabled us to keep this case where it could reach the point where it is now, and we will announce five indictments."

Once that was done I felt that it would have been improper to get up here and vociferate any longer. I had accomplished that.

But I must remind those who have expressed interest that before the murder of Judge Wood, which was predictable, 6 months before I had incessantly spoken on that occasion, I spoke almost 20 times on the attempted assassination of the assistant district attorney for the western district, James W. Kerr. That crime is still unresolved.

□ 1240

Nobody has been arrested and charged with that crime. And I say today as I said then, unless that crime is fully resolved and the culprits brought before the bar of justice and tried and convicted, the Judge Wood case would not itself be fully resolved. I will not address myself to the Judge Wood case at this time because there have been convictions and some of them are on appeal. And I am confident and I want to express my satisfaction, and I think the thanks of many, to the Justice Department, to the Director of the FBI, Judge Webster for a tremendous job and particularly for the Justice Department under very trying and difficult circumstances, with a puffed up case, with their success thus far in the courts. It has been a mixed success but nevertheless it is something that I feel we should be proud of because this crime as I said, time and time again, had brought forth intimidation of the third branch of our Government. After all, we have three branches, they are coequal, they are independent and they are separate.

And if we allow any one of them, like this one is being now, by the executive branch in the case of these so-called Abscam's and so forth—I have spoken out on that, it has not been easy. I have done it only because I have nothing but the deepest love and affection and respect for this great body and above all our country and its Government. Nowhere in the world would it be possible for a man of my status, socially, economically and my background, to be here and to have had the greatest privilege of all, his fellow citizens elected him to the lower rung or the first rung of legislative representation on the city council, then a very high, to me, personally the highest, to the State senate of the State and then here to the National Congress for 21½ years or more. Those are things that I keenly feel and I feel a deep sense of responsibility. Now, I am not saying I am unique. I think every other Member does too. But I feel there is a responsibility to speak out under these circumstances.

When this crime was committed, it used to be in my district, it is not now, that part which was committed. The

crime was committed in the affluent, the nice place, so that happens to be a Republican section. But I felt that it was so significant and it was so awesome, because there was no question in my mind, as I had been predicting after the attempt on James Kerr, that this was a first brazen attempt on that level by organized crime which today is so organized that it is far more sophisticated than anything we have been able to put together on a national level, local level, or State level, by the Government, by the people, to overcome and subjugate this monster which I call King Crime. It has become so interwoven into fronts of business, banks, savings and loans, shopping centers, that outwardly, I do not know if it is possible any longer, I do not know.

I think a lot is going to depend on what we up here will do to keep our faith with the folks. We cannot expect the people to do it for us. That is why they elected us.

I must speak and I will continue to. But at this point I want to report that even though I have not spoken on the House floor since the indictments, back home I have directed a few months ago a letter to the local county district attorney asking him to exert his jurisdiction and attempt to pick up and resolve the case of the attempted murder of James Kerr, the assistant Federal district attorney for the western district, which preceded by 6 months the assassination of Judge Wood.

When and if these convictions in Judge Wood cases are final and God willing I am here, I will again speak out on the Judge Wood case. In the meantime I have spoken out to what I feel would be proper under the circumstances, because even with the best of intentions sometimes instead of helping we can hurt. I want to close out by saying that nothing is more disturbing to me now because of its implications, even greater because of its imminence and its emergence as the pressing No. 1 issue, not only a short-range but huge long-range significant and connotation; and that is our actions and our policy or lack of it with respect to those countries south of the border.

There again for the first time, until then, I spoke out on April 1, 1980. Those who want to accuse me of being partisan would find it hard because the President was Jimmy Carter.

Why did I speak out? I do not think I would have been privileged to serve in an elective, free election process, with no particular support of either money, organized support—I have never had an organization—unless what I said I stood behind and that I had some modicum of efficiency in the pursuit of the discharge of my oath of office. I do not think so. I think the people are so smart that they are not

going to be bamboozled. I see an attitude among so many of my political friends that seem to think that once we are assuming the mantle of public office, that we are smarter. To me it has always been absurd. I have learned more from the people. Ninety percent of whatever I have contributed to legislative accomplishments, bills enacted, resolutions adopted, have been inspired from plain citizens.

I want to say that it is apparent, and after hearing all this almost endless discussion on the so-called freeze resolution, this apparent impression I have had is confirmed; that we are laboring under the tremendous cloud of ignorance, willful in some cases, unfortunate but not willful in others, with respect to the nature of the world.

I see, for instance, that at no time, with respect to the great strategem and the problems in Europe, has anybody here or any President been willing to address the American people and say, "Hey, look, this is another world. This is not 1947 any more. That is gone forever."

In fact, this world and in Latin America particularly, is not the same world it was 5 years ago. If President Kennedy was the President today and he would try to come out identically like he did in 1960, with the so-called Alliance for Progress, he would get nowhere today.

It is another world. It would take too long to go into all of these contributing factors. If Lyndon Johnson was the President and all his advisers told him what they told him in 1965 and he moved into Santo Domingo as he did in 1965 except we must remember this, which this President does not seem to want to realize or his Secretary of State; if he did send the troops to Santo Domingo he did so with the consent and the joinder of the overwhelming majority of the Organization of American States, realizing—and I try to speak only after I know that what I am saying is based on information, not that I have gone to Salvador. My last name does not mean I am an expert on Latin America just because I happen to be with a last name like mine or I am of Mexican descent or whatever, that does not make me an expert. I was born in the United States. So, I am not any more knowledgeable unless I make a special effort. I have not traveled much. I am the least traveled Member of this body. If I go any place like this weekend, it is back to the district.

□ 1250

But when constituents are there, in and out of uniform, in the diplomatic service or any place else, and they travel all the way up here to tell me something, I am going to listen. And I did, I had this happen in August and September 1979.

Those of you who have been following the Salvadoran situation will remember that it was a key date. What these men told me, I had no way of evaluating. They were not asking me to. They were saying that the avenues of communication were so closed that they needed somebody to alert the leaders in the State Department at least, if not somehow the President.

I tried from October, November, December, January, February, March, and there was no access to President Carter.

President Carter was almost—almost—as inaccessible as this one. However, I must say for the record that this is the first President I have worked with who does not answer a Congressman's letter. Even Richard Nixon answered a Congressman's letter. This one does not. And he is not very accessible.

And I am not expressing any personal disappointment. I never bothered Presidents. I never even bothered Lyndon Johnson, who was a 55-mile-away neighbor. The day never happened that I picked up the phone and tried to get him. He called me sometimes, but I never bothered him because I may be for a President politically or I may not be, but once that man is assumed with that office, I am going to try to help him because he has the burden of the world on his shoulders. If I do not agree, I feel it is my duty as a Member of a coequal and independent body to say so. Not to kow-tow, not to do what the press does today and kind of curry up and press against the legs of power and purr. I think we would be abdicating our trust.

On the other hand, I am not going to be so partisan that I would go out of my way to pick flaws and whatnot. I did not do it with Mr. Johnson, I did not do it with Mr. Kennedy, with whom I had a far closer personal association than any one President.

So what I am saying today is that without access to that President I then did what I tried to do and it was to try to get the people in the State Department, and they were inaccessible.

So I then took the floor finally on April 1, after almost 6 months. And it is on the record, so I do not have to go into it. The message was very simple, the same thing I have been saying since and the same thing I have said recently, but I have had a little bit more specific remarks with respect to El Salvador because I had constituents there, both in and out of uniform.

And when I see the contradictions or no policy, when I see that we are headed the same way, and that is to defeat because we are identified. And this is what makes my blood boil. Americans in our society, in our form of government, are the freest, most passionately dedicated to freedom,

they are the most democratic in the true sense of that word, government by the people, the most kindhearted compassionate people anywhere that I know of, and to see us placed in the role of the oppressor and on the side of those who have oppressed, who have tyrannized, who have victimized, who have committed horrible crimes against their own citizens for centuries, hurts me because it is not true, but that is how we are presented right now.

And to see this mindless reaction to communism, Marxism, Leninism. I heard during the debate the other day some gentleman talk about how the Communists in the Spanish revolution of Spain in the thirties had been the agents, provocateurs. Well, let me tell you, that even after from about 30 years, the governments of an authoritarian dictatorship of General Franco, today in Spain the Communist Party is legal. In every election that they have had since the death of Franco you had candidates from the Communist Party. The present Minister or Chief of State, who has an identical surname, is a Socialist. Here we use the words interchangeably. So in trying to refine it, I noticed some of my colleagues saying, Marxist-Leninist. Well, what is our policy in the case of an indigenous movement broiling out of the injustices of centuries, strictly indigenous. There is no Cuban rifle coming in, there is no Russian or Czechoslovakian or North Korean armament coming in, there is not even a Cuban present. But purely indigenous and some of those involved, even Catholic priests, are commingling with colleagues who say, "I am a Marxist-Leninist. I believe in the principles of Marx, et cetera."

And all of a sudden we attack that as we would the case of an imposition from the external forces known as Communists. We still have not devised a policy.

I say it is due to ignorance. Anybody knowing just a minimum of history involving the country that are now 21, in fact the most revealing statement of all to reveal his limitations were President Reagan's when he came back last October from his trip to five of those countries. And the first words he uttered were, "Gee whiz, I didn't know they were that different."

This is unbelievable to me, because it is an egregious error.

I asked President Carter on April 1. I said, "Mr. President, I believe sincerely that the United States has a matter of days beyond which it will not be able to exercise the last vestiges of leadership in the new world."

In effect I was saying, but you can still go, you can still exert American leadership and get collective, not unilateral intervention, but collective. Get these fellow neighbors involved.

So what is happening. We abdicated the leadership this last week. Mexico, Venezuela, Panama met together in Central America. They finally said, this is not printed up here. Down there they said, "We are tired. The United States does not want to do anything except supply the arms to both sides that are killing thousands in Salvador alone." More than 40,000, mostly, mostly innocent women, peasants, that do not know Marx from a computer. In Guatemala right now, with Amercian-made bayonets, 6-month-old babies, their bellies ripped open, in the name of fighting Marxist rebels, who is kidding who? If we want to delude ourselves, OK, let us continue willy-nilly almost like one of these inevitable denouncements in Greek tragedy, but let us not blame it on somebody else. Let us look at ourselves.

These are the things that motivate me to speak out. I have offered specific suggestions. I wrote a letter to the President before he made his trip last autumn. He did not reply to it. Some flunky over in the White House answers and says, "We want you to know that your letter was received here. Thank you very much."

□ 1300

So then what I did, I got my administrative assistant to acknowledge the acknowledgment. If that is the way you want to correspond, that is the way we will correspond.

But it seems to me that these are specific suggestions. I am not just criticizing. And why did I make the suggestion in October? Because I had had an exchange of letters with the head of the Organization of American States who was accepting the idea, and he thought it was good and great, not because I thought it was good and great, but because sincerely I believe we are doomed, we are doomed to failure. America has always stood for justice. We were the revolutionaries all throughout the world. In fact, Ho Chi Minh, his inspiration was the American Revolution. Would 50,000 or more Americans have died in Vietnam, I often wonder, if we had really known history, if we had known what the facts were, what the real world was in 1900. Well, in 1954, when it started down there with the French and our involvement, we gave France over \$5 billion to wage that war.

We have got to remember that when diplomacy fails, then you resort to force. This is the state we are in. I think this is more or less what the note is going to be from the President on Wednesday. But what it amounts to is the declaration of the failure of our diplomacy.

I said, even before I thought I would come to Congress, that it was disturbing to me that we would have to put American boys fighting Asians. The

Russians have not fielded one Russian yet in the field against Asians. Who is failing?

In Europe, their diplomacy, by the sheer weight of history and logic, we forget that. That is what I tell my colleagues, and sometimes they look at it; and maybe I have been brainwashed, but I have never been to Russia. I have yet to meet a live and kicking bona fide Russian and sit down and talk to him. I have never met him. The nearest I came to it was in the hall of the Rayburn Building when my colleague from Texas, then the head of the Science Committee, stopped me and said, "I want you to meet these Russian astronauts." He had them in tow. They did not know who I was. And I just looked at them. He said I was a fellow Texan, and that was it. That is the nearest I have come to it, even though I have been the victim of the FBI, that is, the Hoover era. When I ran for Congress, the local FBI agent in charge and a couple of his minions actually engaged in politicking against me. And later it took my exercise of the freedom of information law, but I will say this, that I got an apology from Director Webster and a promise to expunge that record, because, to my amazement, when I demanded the information, here it comes, and it says on such and such a date, which was right after my election, this local agent was reporting to Mr. Hoover and saying, "Henry Gonzalez, liberal Democrat, just elected to the Congress, with the help of Communists."

Well, I tell you, even my worst enemies in San Antonio would laugh at that, as they did. If there are any around in San Antonio, nobody knows about it, or they have not shown their heads. And I know who helped me. I ought to know. It was a tough fight. I had General Eisenhower going down there 3 days against me. Both of my local newspapers were not for me. It just happened that the people were. But I do not know where the Communists came in. And yet it was in the official records. And if it is in the FBI, then it is in the National Security Agency, because they even tap our phones. If I get a call from a relative in Mexico, the National Security Agency is going to have it.

And I have not traveled in Russia. I was born in San Antonio, Tex., and lived there all my life. I have never been arrested for any reason, nothing, traffic or anything else. And I am proud of that. What I am saying now is that I tell my colleagues, "Hey, look, you are talking about something that you are not going to convince me, because you are overlooking history."

Talk about the Poles, the people in Poland fear the Germans now more than they do the Russians. They may not like the Russians, and they have not liked anybody who has dominated them. Poland has been a country that

has been invaded time and time again. Even the Swedes invaded Poland. But the point is that the history of Middle Europe is vital for us to know, yet we have blithely ignored it. We continue to say that the big issue there is the threat of communism over Europe, when the truth is that the biggest issue and the big original issue is the reunification of Germany. That is the real issue.

World War II has not ended. We still have 30,000 of our folks in Germany. But we still deceive ourselves into thinking that the generation of Germans of 1947 are the same today. It is another world; another generation is there now that does not remember the war and looks at our troops. We changed their designation from "occupation" to "defense." Do you think the average German does? Oh, you have some of these people interpreting elections in Germany. It reminds me of the pollsters, in the words of some fellow who said, "They seem to be polling the fish under the water as to what the birds in the sky are thinking." And this seems to be the same thing in Latin America. We forget history.

During the discussion on Radio Marti or Free Cuba, what I heard here I could not believe. We are so self-centered. Cuba had universities, printing presses—Mexico had the first university and the first printing press more than 150 years before the Pilgrims came up here. The same thing with the Russians. If we were Russian, if the United States were Russia, Canada were China, Mexico were Germany, and let us imagine the United States being where China is, England where India is, and so forth, and all of a sudden Mexico invaded the United States and we lost 20 million Americans to that invasion and, finally, with the help of these countries from overseas we rolled them back, once we did, all of a sudden those big allies would say, "Hey, you know what, we don't trust you guys, we don't like your Communism, we don't like your form of government, we don't like the way you do things, we don't trust you, and you are not going to do what you want to do."

Of course, the Russians want to dismantle Germany like we tried to do after World War I. And you cannot do that to virile, strong civilizations and cultures and countries. The Germans are a great people. What happened is terrible. But who is to vouchsafe that not happening in our country? God is no respecter of nations. He does not favor with more virtue in any particular, one over the other.

Look at what has already happened here in our own backyard in the last year or so. Why, we even had Nazi candidates for public office. And some of them get nominated. Who is to say

that America cannot lose its grace? We do not know. All I know is that we have to work at it, we cannot sit back and say it is self-perpetuating.

But try to imagine that, and then this country would say, "All right, we will partition Mexico, since you are so scared of it yet, but we are going to keep part of it, the English are going to keep part of it, France is going to keep part of it, and then, of course, you will keep what used to be Prussia," which is the most sensitive of all in this great tradition. Even music of great emotional quality is still identified with East Germany or Prussia.

Instead of addressing ourselves to that issue of how we avoid the mistake of World War I and the Versailles, where we were made the patsies by our own allies once the war was over with on the question of paying back the war debts, the greatest issue, twice as much as the official governmental war debts, was the private bankers' debts, because the bankers did then what they have done today and what they want to continue to do with the taxpayers' backing, and that is indulge in an orgy of speculation in these worthless papers and bonds, like they did in the 1920's.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has expired.

THE 1983 AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Legal Services Corporation Act Amendments of 1983. These amendments taken together represent an extension of authorization for one of the most important agencies assisting poor persons in our country.

My bill authorized appropriations for the independent Legal Services Corporation up to \$296 million for fiscal year 1984 and such sums as may be necessary for the next 2 years. This amount for fiscal year 1984 is the same amount as the Congress included in the first budget resolution. This level of funding will maintain the same level of funding provided for in the fiscal years 1982 and 1983 appropriation bills, if adjustments are made for cost of living increases. However, the amount authorized still falls far short of the funding approved in fiscal year 1981 of \$321 million for the Legal Services Corporation. Since that time, funding has been reduced by 25 percent excluding the costs of inflation. Demand for legal services continues to rise.

In addition to setting funding levels, this bill also contains some modest

changes in the manner in which the legal services programs can operate. The changes made in the Organic Act are the product of 4 days of hearings during this Congress by my Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice. I have also attempted to incorporate those provisions from previous authorization bills and continuing resolutions which serve a rational purpose in the current context.

I am confident that a number of amendments will be offered during markup of this bill in subcommittee and in the Committee on the Judiciary. I look forward to that process. Undoubtedly Members will wish to address some of the problems that have arisen with respect to the activities of the Board of Directors of the Corporation. It is also likely that Members will offer changes in other areas relating to other areas of controversy.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am offering today contains seven basic changes in the manner in which the Legal Services Corporation can operate. Outlined below are a summary of those changes:

First, the Corporation is barred from participating in litigation unless the Corporation or a recipient is a party to the litigation, or a recipient is representing an eligible client and the interpretation of this act is in question. The amendment also places employees of the Corporation in the same position as executive branch personnel by applying criminal sanctions to unauthorized lobbying activities. See 18 U.S.C. 1913.

Second, no Corporation funds may be used to influence any Federal, State, or local administrative agency, except where an eligible client has a particular application, claim or case. Similarly no Corporation funds may be used to lobby elected officials, except: First, that communications may be made in response to official requests; second, that communications may be made in connection with authorization or appropriation or oversight measures directly related to the Corporation or a recipient of Corporation funds; or third, any communication, approved by the project director of a recipient, may be made relating to a particular application, claim or case of an eligible client when the relief can be best provided in a legislative forum and when proper documentation is made.

Third, certain procedures are established prior to the commencement of class action litigation against Federal, State, and local government agencies. These procedures require that: First, the project director of the recipient approve the filing of such an action, under rules established by the local governing board; second, that the relief sought be for the primary benefit of eligible clients; and third, that

prior to filing the action the project director has determined that the Government policy challenged is not likely to be changed without resort to such a remedy, and that efforts to resolve the issue without litigation have not been successful or would be adverse to the clients' interest.

Fourth, recipients of Corporation funds are encouraged to negotiate settlements of controversies affecting eligible clients before filing suit.

Fifth, the Corporation is instructed, to the extent feasible, to make available substantial funds for legal assistance to eligible clients through private attorneys. This provision also will require the Corporation to issue regulations to limit the extent of compensation to such private attorneys to reasonable costs and expenses.

Sixth, no Corporation funds may be used for litigation or legal assistance activity relating to abortion matters unless such abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother, except that such limitation does not apply to the provision of legal advice.

Seventh, no funds may be used to represent an individual who is known to be an alien in the United States in violation of the law.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I view this bill as the beginning of what will hopefully be a complete legislative process. In each of the last 2 years the funds for the Corporation and its accompanying authorization have been tied up with the various continuing resolutions. Thus, the Corporation and its recipient programs have been forced to limp along from day to day not knowing their fate. If the Congress can act expeditiously on an authorization bill perhaps we can avoid that problem. In this regard I was pleased to see the introduction on April 21, 1983, of a Senate measure (S. 1133) with respect to the Legal Services Corporation (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9445-9448). Senator EAGLETON's bipartisan measure contains some of the features found in my bill. In addition, it appears to contain a number of significant improvements in the operations of the Corporation and to preserve its independence. I anticipate that in the months ahead that Members on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses will wish to devote careful attention to this important matter.●

LEGISLATION REVISING GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO ALIENS AND NATIONALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to revise and codify without substantive change cer-

tain general and permanent laws, related to aliens and nationality, as title 8, United States Code. This bill has been prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel as a part of the program of the office to prepare and submit to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, for enactment into positive law, all titles of the United States Code.

The bill makes no change in the substance of existing law.

This bill is the successor to H.R. 6754, introduced in the 97th Congress on July 14, 1982. That bill and its accompanying report were made available to interested Government agencies and the general public for comment during the latter part of 1982. Those comments have been taken into account in preparing this bill.

Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of the bill and accompanying report should contact: Edward F. Willett, Jr., law revision counsel, House of Representatives, H2-304, House Annex No. 2, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Persons wishing to comment on the bill should submit those comments to the Office of the Law Revision Counsel not later than June 1, 1983.●

□ 1310

PARADOX AND HYPOCRISY OF ARMS BUILDUP AND LONG-TERM GRAIN SALES TO SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WEAVER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few brief remarks today on the paradox and hypocrisy of President Reagan's policies of arms buildup to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union and turning around this weekend and offering to negotiate long-term sales.

Agriculture is the fundamental of any society's economy. This is not clearly recognized today when we think that agriculture is just one other segment of our industrial society, and if the steel industry goes down some people suffer, or if the car industry goes down or if the timber industry goes down people suffer, but the economy can go on. If agriculture goes down, the whole economy will founder. Agriculture is the foundation. Depending on how many people each farmer can feed is how many people are free to take up other pursuits; in other words, if it takes 50 percent of our people to feed the Nation, then only 50 percent of the people are free to do things such as build homes, manufacture steel, or report, or be in politics.

So as we neglect our agriculture, and as other nations such as Poland and elsewhere neglect their agriculture,

their economies will sink. Today, because our agricultural economy had become so desperate, farmers going bankrupt, loans in default throughout the Nation, prices below the cost of production, the administration brought forth the payment-in-kind program, which has, in effect, given away our entire reserves of grains in this country. There is even cause to suspect that we are borrowing on this year's crop to make the payment-in-kind program commitments.

So, therefore, we are denuding our reserves at a time when weather is more capricious than at any time I have seen it. The El Nino off the coast of South America is such that the anchovy crop, which feeds millions and millions of people through the anchovies being made into fish meal and fed to poultry and other animals, the El Nino has devastated the anchovy crop. The weather may, capricious as it is, devastate our crops, the remaining acreage that will be planted in this country this year.

So we are faced with an agriculture that has sunk to a very low state economically, a denuding of our reserves, with weather so capricious that it is possible we could have a devastating crop year, and what does the President do? The President says we are going to give all the grain we possibly can to the Soviet Union, and at the same time demanding of the Congress that we increase our military buildup to defend ourselves against the Soviet Union.

I say this is not only a paradox, but pure hypocrisy. The United States is the largest grain supplier in the world. We are, in effect, the OPEC of grain. In the last number of years, we have furnished over 80 percent of the soybeans in world markets, 70 percent of the corn, 50 percent of the wheat, and yet we have sold this grain to the wealthiest nations in the world, not the poor and undeveloped nations, but the wealthiest nations of the world, at below the cost of production. We have subsidized every bushel of grain that we have sold overseas; in effect subsidizing the wealthy nations that have bought them. And who are these wealthy nations? The OPEC countries are buyers of 25 percent of our overseas grain. Japan has been the largest single buyer of our grain, one of the wealthiest nations in the world, the one with the greatest balance of payments position. And also the Soviet Union.

Every bushel of grain that we sell to the Soviet Union frees them up to build more armaments. Every single time we subsidize the Soviet Union with grain below the cost of production, we are giving out of our taxpayers' pockets, out of the Federal coffers, and out of the pockets of the farmers, money to the Soviet Union to help them increase their arms buildup.

This President that has announced that he will now negotiate long-term commitments to the Soviet Union for our grain is the very one saying we should build up our arms, spend whatever money we have left, take away from the senior citizens, take away from the poor, take away from jobs programs, in order to spend more money on our military, is the same President that now wants to subsidize the Soviet Union.

I say the Congress should examine this grain sale to the Soviet Union and examine it closely. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to offer amendments on the floor of the House of Representatives to, among other bills, the Export Act that must be reauthorized before the fall, to prohibit the United States from selling grain to the Soviet Union at less than the cost of production. At the minimum, if we sell grain to the Soviet Union, we should not subsidize the Soviet Union by selling that grain below the cost of production.

Now, there are reasons to sell grain to the Soviet Union, not the least of which is to make sure our farmers have markets, but as important a reason, I think, is that to better relations with the Soviet Union and ourselves, to make the world more stable, to assure the prospects of peace and not nuclear annihilation, it is possible that grain sales to the Soviet Union over a long term might be worthwhile. But I find it asinine, ridiculous, stupid, and absurd, and hypocrisy of the greatest moment to demand an arms buildup, a nuclear buildup to defend ourselves from the Soviet Union at the same times as we give them our grain at bargain basement prices.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is time the Congress examine our fundamental policy of grain sales to the Soviet Union, weight them in the balance of peace in the world and our own military buildup and the Russian military buildup. We cannot go helter-skelter any longer giving away our grain at the very time we have denuded all our reserves, and the weather may end up denuding our present crop that is going to be grown this year.

In 1972, the year of the Great Russian Grain Robbery, when the Russians scooped up all our reserves, bought them at bargain basement price and suddenly we had bad crop years, El Nino was on the coast of South America and denuded their anchovy crop, our food prices skyrocketed. In 3 years the food prices shot so high that it inaugurated the inflation that we have just come out of, and we can have another round of this inflation, of food inflation, if indeed we continue the policy of denuding our grain reserves and giving the balance to the Soviet Union.

We leave ourselves defenseless. I was the author of the national grain re-

serve program in this Congress, and that national grain reserves has meant that we had reserves in case of bad crop years, but under the PIK program, the payment-in-kind programs, those reserves are virtually gone.

So I ask colleagues in this Congress, let us examine, both in committee and on the floor, the policy of making long-term grain commitments to the Soviet Union and I intend to help in that examination.

□ 1320

FORMER DIRECTOR OF CIA SUPPORTS NUCLEAR FREEZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, supporters of House Joint Resolution 13, which calls for a mutual and verifiable freeze in the development, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, and I include myself among its supporters, claim the freeze could bring a dramatic halt to the nuclear arms race, without jeopardizing our national security. In a particularly cogent article prepared for the Washington Post, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, William Colby, agrees with freeze proponents and declares further that it would end President Reagan's policy of appeasement. It is one of the best statements in support of the freeze resolution that I have seen and I urge my colleagues to read it.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post]

REAGAN SHOULD TURN FROM "APPEASEMENT" TO A FREEZE

(By William E. Colby)

To use language meaningful to those of President Reagan's generation (and my own), appeasement doesn't work. I am sure the president would agree with that statement, but in fact, he is engaged in a program of appeasement. NATO's first resolute decision to deploy 108 Pershing II missiles and 464 cruise missiles to meet the Soviet SS20 buildup has been followed by the president's proposal of a zero option on both sides, rejected by the Soviets, and then a suggestion for an interim solution, also rejected by the Soviets.

The president's proposal to supplant the SALT II treaty by the START proposal to reduce strategic launchers to 850 on each side and warheads to 5,000, no more than half of which would be land-based, has been rejected by the Soviets. The U.S.S.R. made a minimal move in our direction by suggesting an 1,800-launcher limit. The administration now considers means by which it could move off its original proposal toward the Soviet position.

Another appeasement being attempted is of the anti-nuclear and nuclear freeze movements in the West. The political force of these movements led the administration to soften its previous positions, in hopes of diluting the impatience of millions of Europeans and Americans over their governments' inability to reduce the nuclear terror to

which they are exposed. Minor variations of the degree of terror certainly are not going to appease these movements, particularly when these gestures are matched by plans to bring in new weapons systems like the MX, the D5, the B1, and a whole new dimension of space warfare.

The real requirement is for a bold move to halt the arms race, as a clear indication of resolution to reduce the nuclear terror to which all our populations are subjected. This is the basis for the call for a mutual and verifiable freeze on the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. A recitation of what this freeze will produce in benefits to the safety of the United States is a compelling argument for Reagan to leapfrog the obstructionists who urge his to oppose it and instead take leadership of it.

A simple projection of current weapons plans that would be obviated by a freeze demonstrates its value to the safety of our country:

(1) A freeze on new types of land-based missiles permitted under SALT II would halt the present Soviet testing of two new types. It would also halt the MX. The prime characteristic of these new weapons is an increase in accuracy and consequent targeting of the land-based missile systems of the other side. While the so-called "first-strike" scenario is discussed as a theoretical possibility today, the advent of these new weapons systems will bring it remarkably closer. Both sides will be convinced that the other will soon have the potential for a single devastating blow, requiring that it keep itself on hair-trigger alert for an equally devastating response. The decision time in such circumstances will be reduced so that automatic, not human, decisions will have to be programmed, offering the sickening prospect of mutual destruction through machine error.

(2) A freeze would bar the development of cruise missile armadas on both sides. While the United States is technologically ahead with this new device to date, it is predictable that the Soviets will develop their own capability within the next decade. They did just that with respect to the MIRV, after it was left out of SALT I in 1972 because the United States had no incentive to bar itself from something the Soviets did not then have. At the end of this decade, we can confidently expect a national debate over the need for a comprehensive air defense system to protect the United States from a Soviet cruise missile armada. This whole development would be eliminated by a freeze today.

(3) A freeze would bar the further development and deployment of the Blackjack bomber on the Soviet side and of the B1 on the American side. This would have to be clarified in the discussions leading to the freeze agreement, but it seems clear that the strategic arms negotiating history considers intercontinental aircraft to be launchers rather than platforms. Again, this would prevent the buildup of a large Soviet intercontinental nuclear air force requiring the kind of air defense system the Soviets are now hoping can hold off at least some of our B52s.

(4) The freeze would bar the development of the D5 missile by the United States, with its improvements in accuracy leading to the danger of first strike from the sea. Similarly, it would bar a more accurate Soviet submarine-launched missile. It would not bar the replacement of Polaris submarines by Tritons because the negotiating history has considered submarines as platforms

rather than as launchers. The Soviets are currently considerably behind the United States in submarine technology, but again it can be confidently expected that they will improve over the next decades through a combination of espionage, allocation of resources and talent, and plain competitive determination. A freeze on launchers would limit the application of those improvements in the nuclear dimension.

Each of the arguments against the freeze collapses under careful examination:

(1) The Soviets are certainly not "superior" to the United States in any meaningful way today. If they were, we would see them using that superiority, rather than indicating concern over the technological superiority of the United States and its ability to leap ahead in technology in the coming years at a pace beyond that possible for the Soviet Union. The present American retaliation potential is absolute, and with a modicum of maintenance, its components will not vanish from old age.

The Soviets restrict their adventurism these days to the safer techniques of proxy war, subversion and attempts to encourage weakness of American will and separation from European opinion. This is not the bluster of someone convinced that he has the power to dominate. It is the williness of someone operating from a position of weakness, trying to slow the opponent down without direct confrontation.

(2) Could we verify whether the Soviets would abide by such an agreement? The administration's own reports show that we are doing exactly that in our attention to potential violations of SALT II and the steady buildup of Soviet power. The fact is that our intelligence system will cover the Soviet Union's nuclear weaponry whether there is a freeze between us or not; a freeze treaty would merely make it easier to do so because of the numerous elements included in recent treaties to facilitate the process. Even in areas of ambiguity, of which there will certainly be some, such as the current indications of Soviet violation of the chemical and biological treaty, it is plain that our intelligence systems have picked up these activities. They have not occurred without being exposed to outside scrutiny.

The fact that the Soviets might violate a treaty is not the determinant. No one should "trust" them not to do so. The real point is whether we would catch them at it and be able to act upon that information. The evidence today indicates that this is clearly the case. Any violation that would be extensive enough to have an impact on the strategic balance would certainly be noticed by us.

The real question is what we proposed to do about a violation rather than whether we would know of it. In this respect, there are improvements that can be made in procedures, such as third-party investigations and decisions, interim sanctions and greater visibility upon challenge. The Soviets have shown themselves in recent treaties to be willing to yield some of their long-held phobias against exposure of their affairs, provided that the result is specifically in their interest.

(3) A freeze would certainly be of advantage to the Soviet Union, halting the major American nuclear buildup now planned. As with any successful treaty, however, the question is whether it would be in the equal interest of the United States, halting a certain further Soviet buildup of nuclear weaponry, which, or course, it would. We can protect the United States better by convinc-

ing the Soviet Union not to develop new weapons systems than by developing the defensive systems to shoot them down if they are used against us.

Thus appeasement is not the answer. It does not satisfy the nuclear priesthood, which thinks only of building new and more complex weapons systems. It does not satisfy the Soviets, as every indication of yielding is taken as a weakening of will to achieve a mutual solution to the arms race. It does not satisfy the opponents of nuclear warfare among the broad populations of Europe and the United States, who believe their leadership has failed to protect them against potential annihilation as a result of the inexorable march of technology.

Only a bold, firm call for a mutual stop in the arms race could cut through the present tangled political and diplomatic negotiations and produce a result worthy of an American president. ●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BATEMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of attending a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. BOEHLERT (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of attending a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of attending a meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GLICKMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WEAVER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RODINO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, for 60 minutes, on April 28.

Mr. BROOKS, for 60 minutes, on May 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEAVER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEAL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAY, for 5 minutes, on April 27.

Mr. WEAVER, for 30 minutes, on April 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. VUCANOVICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PORTER in six instances.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. FORSYTHE.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. MARRIOTT.

Mr. SAWYER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GLICKMAN and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. BEDELL.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. FAUNTROY.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating the week of November 20, 1983, through November 26, 1983, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 24 through April 30, 1983, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate October 16, 1983, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution designating November 1983 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

984. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

985. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on loan, guarantee and insurance transactions supported by Eximbank during March 1983, to Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

986. A letter from the Secretary of the Department of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain discretionary programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

987. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice, transmitting the seventh annual report of the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, pursuant to section 207(e) of Public Law 93-415; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

988. A letter from the Executive Director, Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting a sectional analysis of proposed legislation transmitted by the Board on February 25, 1983 (Ex. Com. No. 519); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

989. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting notice of a new records system for the Department of Defense, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

990. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations pertaining to a candidate's use of property in which his or her spouse has an interest, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d)(1); to the Committee on House Administration.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs, transmitting a proposed plan for the use and distribution of the judgment funds awarded to the Potawatomi Nation of Indians by the Indian Claims Commission and the U.S. Court of Claims, pursuant to section 2(a) and 4 of Public Law 93-134, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

992. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting an annual report for 1982 on the national airway system, pursuant to section 504(b)(2) of Public Law 97-248; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

993. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the critical materials requirements of the U.S. aerospace industry, pursuant to section 55(c) (1) and (2) of Public Law 96-479; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

994. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of pro-

posed legislation to permit free entry into the United States of the personal effects, equipment, and other related articles of foreign participants, officials, and other accredited members of delegations involved in the games of the XXIII Olympiad to be held in the United States in 1984; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

995. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the administration, contain escalating costs and create greater flexibility in the operation of programs under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and Labor.

996. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the triennial assessment of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal years 1980-82 (RCED-83-123, Apr. 15, 1983); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on April 21, 1983, the following report was filed on April 22, 1983]

Mr. SWIFT: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 2621. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1984; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed April 25, 1983]

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2600. A bill to dedicate the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to Phillip Burton; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. (for himself, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 2717. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to make certain changes in the authority of the Office of Government Ethics, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 2718. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, relating to the coordination of Federal information policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 2719. A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation Act to authorize appropriations for additional fiscal years, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELDS (for himself and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 2720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat as medical care the expenses of meals and lodging of a parent or guardian accompanying a child away from home for the purpose of receiving medical care, and the expenses of meals and lodging of a child away from home for the purpose of receiving medical care on an outpatient basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.R. 2721. A bill to authorize funds for fiscal year 1984 for carrying out the International Travel Act of 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. FORTSYTHE, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mrs. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 2722. A bill to amend the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Act of 1977 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of such act for fiscal years 1984-85, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KINDNESS:

H.R. 2723. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to remove the limitation on the use of materials produced by convict labor in construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. McNULTY (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. MCCAIN):

H.R. 2724. A bill to designate the Aravaipa Canyon Wilderness in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 2725. A bill to amend section 924(c) of title 18 of the United States Code to extend and strengthen the mandatory penalty feature of the prohibition against the use of deadly or dangerous weapons in Federal felonies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON) (by request):

H.R. 2726. A bill to authorize appropriations for exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 2727. A bill to codify without substantive change recent laws related to money and finance and transportation and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2728. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to aliens and nationality, as title 8, United States Code, "Aliens and Nationality"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUMWAY (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

H.R. 2729. A bill to provide for a uniform product liability law; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. REID):

H.R. 2730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that net legal wagering gains shall not be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify certain re-

quirements regarding withholding and reporting at the source and to correct inequities regarding carryover of losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COELHO:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution designating May 1983 as "National Play-It-Safe Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

94. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the management of wild horses and burros; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. GORE and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 29: Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.R. 70: Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 225: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 672: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BARNES, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ROE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. REID, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1092: Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1147: Mr. WON PAT.

H.R. 1266: Mr. BEVILL and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1315: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. RUDD, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. WYLLIE.

H.R. 1381: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1400: Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1603: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1617: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. FORTSYTHE, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

H.R. 1619: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1691: Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 1797: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. FERRARO, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1873: Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. YATES, Mr. WEAVER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1942: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 2076: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. KINDNESS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ERLÉNBERN, Mr.

BLILEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. COATS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. VANDERGRIF, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 2099: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. EDGAR, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FROST, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2100: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. EDGAR, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FROST, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2131: Mr. FRANK, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. YATES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ROE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2323: Mr. YATRON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GORE, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2379: Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 2490: Mr. ECKART, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 2582: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 2600: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DWYER, of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. SAM B. HALL, Jr., Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LELAND.

H.J. Res. 160: Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. CARPER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.J. Res. 243: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRE-

LAND, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. BONKER and Mr. TALLON.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. HARTNETT.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. WALGREN.

H. Res. 50: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. GRAY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1983

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

—Page 16, after line 11, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) In providing assistance under this title, the Secretary shall (1) seek to assure a reasonable distribution of funds among districts in which the program established in this title is in effect; and (2) take into consideration the rates of residential mortgage foreclosure and unemployment in the units of general local government in which the properties involved are located, giving particular consideration to units of general local government having rates of unemployment that exceed the national average. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Secretary shall utilize the most recent information available from the Secretary of Labor with respect to rates of unemployment.

H.R. 1190

By Mr. MADIGAN:

—Page 9, after line 3, insert the following new section (and redesignate succeeding sections and references accordingly):

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Sec. 5. Section 310B of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C.

1932) is amended by striking out subsection (c).

—Page 9, line 9, strike out "\$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000".

Page 9, line 10, strike out "\$400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$350,000".

—Page 29, beginning on line 18, strike out "such \$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000,000 of such amount".

H.J. Res. 13

By Mr. GINGRICH:

—At the end of the joint resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. . Nothing in this joint resolution shall lead the United States Government to take any action which, in the collective judgement of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, would threaten the survival of the United States.

—On page 4, line 14, immediately after the word "capabilities" insert the following: "and with our ability to provide for the common defense under the Constitution of the United States".

By Mr. LEVITAS:

(Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. MURTHA.)

—At the end of the new language added in "(1)" and following the word "reductions" add the following "which reductions will be achieved within a reasonable time period as determined by such negotiations."

By Mr. PORTER:

(Amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BROOMFIELD.)

—Immediately after the last line of the text of the Broomfield amendment add the following new section:

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that the President should propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in the context of the relevant negotiations, immediate adherence by the Government of the United States and the Government of the Soviet Socialist Republics to the principles of a guaranteed strategic build-down of nuclear forces, subjected to agreed procedures of verification and compliance.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NEED TO REDISCOVER THE
WILL TO WIN

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered recently by Mr. Reece A. Overcash, Jr., the chief executive officer of Associates Corp. of North America which is based in my congressional district.

The speech is titled "The Need To Discover the Will To Win" and was delivered by Mr. Overcash before the Radford, Va., Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Overcash talks about the intangible factors of economic recovery, including a "rekindled national will." He is absolutely correct that an economic recovery is only half the battle of defeating what ails this country. Accepting the change that must accompany a recovery is also a part of the battle, and Mr. Overcash's thoughts on this subject are well worth the reading. I strongly recommend the speech to my colleagues.

THE NEED TO REDISCOVER THE WILL TO WIN
(By Reece A. Overcash, Jr.)

I am very pleased to be with you and, most importantly, be able to look back on some of my economic comments a year ago, recognizing our nation is beginning to show signs of a resurgence. February retailing was stronger. The administration expects to revise its forecast to reflect a more favorable economy. Factory orders showed a strong gain in January.

We are certainly not out if yet. Unemployment is a grave concern. In Texas, unemployment hit 8.8 percent in February compared with 5.3 a year ago.

The country is not well by any means, but the economy appears to be on the mend.

But, is this a long-term healing or a temporary mend? That's the serious question we must grapple with.

Housing is on the rebound, the stock market is soaring, oil prices are falling, and earlier this month the Composite Index of Leading Economic Indicators took its biggest upward leap since July, 1950.

The question no longer is whether the economy will mend. The question is how powerful the turnaround will prove to be. By the fourth quarter, more and more business leaders believe, the recovery could be racing along in high gear. It's obvious that we are in a period of great change in America. A period that requires strength of character and a will of giant proportion. How much we encourage change and how well we adapt to change will help determine the strength and duration of our recovery.

Change, of course, is no stranger to any of us. But I'm not so sure we are as ready for change today as we have been in past decades.

There appears to be a vast portion of the population which seems to want things to stay as they are. Don't rock the boat. But I'll tell you a secret, if we're not ready to rock the boat, we're going to grow barnacles and we're going to sink.

In this great state of Virginia, during the early years of our country's history, change was a daily occurrence. Some of the most important events in American history took place here.

It was here in Virginia at Jamestown in 1607 that the first permanent English settlement was established; and 12 years later the Jamestown colonists established the first representative legislature in America.

Eight U.S. presidents were born in this great state; and thus it derives the nickname "Mother of Presidents". These were men of strong will, unafraid of change.

Four of the first five presidents were from Virginia, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and James Monroe. Where could there possibly be a stronger heritage in this nation than here, the state of Virginia?

Virginia was a cauldron of change in the days when change represented the cornerstone of a new way of life . . . a new way of freedom. I wonder do we in fact have the will today to do what is necessary—both in the private and the public sector—either to make the necessary sacrifices and changes or take advantage of opportunities.

PERIODS OF GREAT CHANGE

All the systems of our nation—economic, religious, military, medicine, law, the professions, the social and political institutions—all are changing rapidly.

Five or six years ago Drucker named this era the "Age of Discontinuity," and Toffler called it "Future Shock." Both men have since updated their books—"Managing in Turbulent Times" by Drucker, and "The Third Wave" by Toffler are their latest editions—which continue to document this age of transformation.

Since 1970, our employment has increased from 75 million to 100 million. But, of the 25 million new jobs, only 2.3 million were in manufacturing. Almost all new jobs have come in the services industries; and this will continue throughout the '80's.

Today there are 100 million Americans working, only 1.3 million less than the all time high in 1981. Disposable income this year is at an all time high.

It is true that we have high unemployment; and we have many severe economic problems stemming from the dislocations and transformations in our industrial society. But, we are working our way out of this; and our forecasts for the next five to seven years are very positive.

What this nation needs is an economic boom. A boom would for one thing reduce overall joblessness, obviating the need for multi-billion-dollar jobs programs. Many lost jobs, as in steel and autos, won't ever be recovered, but here tax credits for retraining workers making more sense than do public works projects.

A boom would greatly reduce projected deficits; thus the alleged need for tax hikes

and defense-spending cuts would greatly lessen.

But positive, long-term economic stability can only be achieved if we have the will to make change, to be efficient, to alter that which no longer serves a useful purpose.

In The Associates television commercials currently appearing on network coverage of the PGA golf tournaments (perhaps you have seen them), we emphasize the line "You've got the Will, We've got the Ways." We take time to tell the American public that they do have the will. That's the people we want to serve. . . people with the guts and raw determination to make good things happen in their lives.

That's a point we need to keep paramount at all times. We do have the will. We can find the ways. Let us stay our current course until we see more clearly what course we are on. If the nation is no longer in a recession, what sense does it make to fight recession?

A WILL REDISCOVERY

To find long term solutions, what this country needs is not just an economic recovery. We need that too. But, also we need a "will rediscovery." We need to rediscover our sense-of-purpose, of will. The old cliché "Where there's a will, there's a way" needs to be dusted off and re-mounted over the fireplace. Perhaps if we rediscover our will, we'll do a lot more than achieve an economic recovery. Perhaps we can reach a new level of national pride.

How strong is our will, when we note that today of the world's 22 largest blast furnaces, two-thirds sit in Japan where there is virtually no coal or iron ore. None of them is in the United States which is estimated to have the largest known coal and iron ore reserves in the world. Virginia is one of this nation's leading coal mining states.

Do we have the will to put our industrial machinery back to work full time. We are currently using only about 69 percent of our total industrial capacity. In 1962, we imported a total of 7.6 billion dollars worth of manufactured goods; and last year, marking a 20 year span, the total was about 20 times that—at 143 billion dollars.

Auto industry employment is down about 34 percent over the past two decades; and the steel industry has seen a decline in its employment in the same period of about 48 percent. But, and this is the disturbing fact that questions our will, total automobile imports have increased 43 percent and steel imports have increased 46 percent.

Thus, we continue to consume high levels of steel-related products—but it's not our steel, and it doesn't represent our people's productivity.

INNOVATION OVERCOMES OBSTACLES

We could take a quick view of historic events over the last ten years and perhaps conclude that our will to win has been sapped. That these events have blurred our vision of the great American heritage.

In 1973, the fourth and largest Arab-Israeli war began, followed by an oil embargo impacting the entire world's economics.

In 1974 Richard M. Nixon announced his resignation as president of the United

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

States, the first ever to do so. The next year, four highly placed Nixon aides were found guilty of the Watergate coverup; South Vietnam surrendered to the Communists; and Saigon was captured by the North Vietnamese troops.

In 1976, the Chinese exploded a nuclear device resulting in fall-out over the U.S. In 1977, Vietnam draft evaders were pardoned. And, in 1978, following an 18 month freeze on oil prices, OPEC increased prices 14 percent.

From more recent years, we can all recall with vivid memory the rise of the Ayatollah Khomeini, the Russians marching in Afghanistan, the battle for the Falkland Islands.

A devastating recession planted itself deep in the economies of the world, and the United States experienced a shock to its economic system with a frightening level of unemployment, factory production dramatically falling and business bankruptcies soaring to new record levels.

Consumers became conservative. Retailing went into a tailspin. And, national deficit estimates skyrocketed to levels of \$200 billion.

Isn't that enough to weaken anyone's will? I say no—our will must be unyielding. Let me use The Associates as an example of a strong will.

In the period that I've just recounted from 1974 to 1983, The Associates achieved an outstanding record of growth. Our best ever in fact. Operating income increased at an average annual rate of 26 percent during those difficult years. This represented a total dollar income gain of \$160 million. Our operating earnings in that period increased from \$18 million to something in the area of 10 times that amount this year. We had the will to win, not just to survive.

Our record in that period far outstripped our competition, and was the Company's most successful decade in its history, which dates back to 1918.

Most recently, the Company posted a 54 percent increase in earnings for the first six months of fiscal 1983 which ended January 31.

Starting with the mid-70's, The Associates undertook dramatic changes. Our will to win was just too great to accept the status quo. In 1976, the Company took a bold move and relocated its headquarters from South Bend, Indiana to Dallas. We altered our business mix. We broadened our commercial operations and have now achieved recognition as a national lender in the commercial credit market.

Consumer operations took on increased real estate-secured lending; and two years ago we organized a diversified product group to concentrate on innovative opportunities in financial services.

Real estate-secured loans jumped from about 5.4 percent of our receivables to about 21 percent. In dollars, it was a tenfold increase from just over \$100 million to over \$1 billion.

We have had substantial management change, with a number of broad-based executives taking on corporate and division responsibilities.

Our answer to difficult economic conditions was to develop financial products to meet changing needs. We were not fearful of change. We were stimulated by it. We innovated.

For example, we initiated the country's first credit card program which provided a rebate—up to one percent of the credit card purchases each year.

Our credit card program was not going to be a "me-too" program. Our VISA credit

card program is now one of the best in the country.

We developed new revolving loan products to allow customers to quickly borrow against an established line of credit. With a \$50,000 revolving line of credit you may never need a bank loan again for personal use.

Through Associates National Bank in California, we initiated a creative savings program called the Retirement Management Account (RMA). Through this savings option, customers can achieve a yield as high as 30 percent on retirement funds, depending on the level of passbook savings maintained with the bank.

All of these are part of an expanding array of consumer financial products and represent our increasing effort to establish a financial relationship with a client rather than participate in a single loan transaction.

Add all this to The Associates strong traditional and innovative commercial businesses, plus insurance services and you can see how we have responded to change. Our will has never been stronger.

POSITIVE EFFECTS OF DEREGULATION

Changes in the financial services industry have resulted largely from growing deregulation. In May, 1982, Treasury Secretary Regan told the Electronic Funds Transfer Association that "The administration is committed to deregulation of the financial services industry because it is in the best interests of the consumer." Certainly the changes we have seen thus far have accured to the consumer's benefit. Deregulation is in the best interests of the country.

To a large degree we and others in the financial services industry have been innovative because of a lessening of government controls. This is a critical change for our business and for American consumers.

As a result of deregulation, the banks, thrift institutions, brokerage firms and the rest of us in the financial services industry are competing harder and more creatively than ever before. The regulated differences are melting away and now we must compete on the basis of efficiency, price and service.

Regulation limits innovation. It inhibits change and too often rewards weakness.

Deregulation, on the other hand, stimulates competition, increases innovation and opportunities. It brings about positive change.

It is a dynamic, public-serving and necessary revolution in the field of financial services. Those who have the will to excel and follow through with consumer oriented programs will advance. The others will drop far behind.

A number of new entrants such as Sears, Prudential, and Shearson/American Express and others, all offer potential for fully integrated, multi-product distribution systems, now described by the media as the "financial supermarkets" of the future. Grocers like Krogers now offer financial services. ATM systems are now nationwide.

In turn, many traditional financial institutions are seeking ways to expand their networks for the delivery of products and services.

Citicorp took a major step toward preparing for interstate banking with its recently approved acquisition of an ailing California thrift institution.

Bank of America is teaming up with discount broker Charles Schwab. Chase Manhattan and Crocker National, among others, are establishing variations of "active assets" accounts in an attempt to counter the inroads made by money market funds. Detroit

National Bank has announced plans to be the "electronic switch" for a network of automated teller machines in 35 states.

The Associates financial family includes a California-based bank and soon will include a savings and loan association.

Why the rush into financial services by so many non-banking companies like Sears, Merrill Lynch, Prudential-Bache, American Express? The reason is rather basic and it's traditional to American thinking.

The financial services industry, even with its progress, growth and service to the public, still is essentially an underdeveloped frontier. There is a will to win working in this industry unsurpassed by any other.

MEETING CONSUMERS' NEEDS

With all this competition and deregulation, the consumer is in the driver's seat like never before. And that is as it should be.

The consumers of the future will take less for granted and will research more what is being offered. They will more carefully select their bank, stock broker and consumer lender, and they will more readily recognize that this is a buyer's market.

Some say, "Slow down and allow more time for the transition." It's an old, familiar tune. Some people resent change. Yet change through deregulation is healthy.

I urge you to keep an eye on the financial services industry, because it is a microcosm of traditional American strengths and values. In today's environment, the innovative will succeed. The consumer will be the winner. Change is being turned into positive productivity.

In a recent bylined article in *Psychology Today*, Chrysler Chairman Lee A. Iacocca took a hard look at change and the need for changes, in quoting FDR: "The country needs, and demands bold persistent experimentation." I agree with Mr. Iacocca that it's time we rebuilt America and revitalized her industrial base, and that we take the steps that common sense demands.

We need to rediscover our will to make things happen the way we want . . . to benefit from change. Economic recovery is only half the battle.

On January 25, 1983, President Ronald Reagan addressed that subject in his State of the Union message to the American people. This was the 196th time that a president in the United States reported on the state of the union since Virginian George Washington established that tradition in 1790.

He recognized in that state of the union message, as in so many made by other presidents before it, that this country is by no means perfect but there is none better. He also recognized that there are problems, but also solutions.

And, in that particular message Mr. Reagan emphasized that "It is just plain wrong, unjust to our country and unjust to our people to let those problems stand in the way of the most important truth of all; America is on the mend."

It is high time that we as Americans take the initiative to look forward in a positive way and take the actions necessary to solve problems. Above all let's give workable solutions a chance to work.

You know General George Patton, a man who had the will of steel, considered one of his primary principles the statement, "Never make a decision too early or too late". He had the insight to let a workable solution achieve its objective.

General Patton had a lot to say in his principles that bears repeating today. Let

me share with you a few additional principles included in Porter B. Williamson's book "Patton's Principles—A Handbook for Managers Who Mean It."

Other Patton Principles include:

(1) No one is thinking if everyone is thinking the same thing. Thus, innovation and change go hand-in-glove with sound thinking.

(2) Success is how you bounce on the bottom. Even the best will have their moments of despair and even defeat. Success is realized in how well you bounce back—how well this nation bounces back.

(3) Too Much If'n Perhaps'n and Maybe'n will never win the battle. To win we need to take action. That speaks directly to making our economy strong again.

General Patton also said, in his principles, "In life as in flying a plane, some people are never ready to take off."

Well I'm ready. I am excited about the prospects of the future. I am excited about what's going on today in the financial services industry and the potential that it offers to my company, its employees and to the people that we serve directly.

If we have the will, we'll find the ways. I know you join me in this positive pursuit. Let's rediscover this nation's will. Most important let's remind others to do the same. And let our government enrich our lives by pursuing less regulation and rewarding outstanding performance.

Let's have the will to stay our course, to stimulate an economic boom and to develop the most dramatic recovery this nation has ever witnessed.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY—LET US NEVER FORGET

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1983

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, within the past several weeks, we have witnessed and commemorated the memory of the most tragic occurrence in the history of the human race—the Holocaust. We must never forget this systematic attempt to eliminate the Jewish people from the face of the Earth. In this century, the most violent and bloody ever, another less-known but equally repulsive and reprehensible nightmare stained the record of mankind which we likewise must never be permitted to forget or forgive. The calculated genocide of a million and a half Armenians by the Ittihadist Turkish leaders of the Ottoman Empire from 1914 to 1918 cannot be simply viewed in retrospect as a terrible episode to be remembered for simply moral reasons or for its possible deterrent value. The effects of that tragedy continue to have a significant impact in the contemporary world because more than half of the world's Armenians live scattered throughout the world, removed from their historic homeland while the remainder must endure life within the borders of the Soviet Union. The result is that the very identity of the Armenian people is threatened.

The historical evidence and documentation of the Armenian massacres of 1914-18 is irrefutable. At the very least, the present administration should retract a disclaimer made by the State Department in its August 1982 issue of "Bulletin" in which it stated that, "Because the historical record of 1915 events in Asia Minor is ambiguous, the Department of State does not endorse allegations that the Turkish Government committed a genocide against the Armenian people." Such a statement is outrageous and insensitive not only to Armenians, but to all free people and all people who aspire to be free.

As we commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day, let us pledge that the grave injustice and suffering of the brave and fiercely independent Armenian people never be denied or forgotten. To do anything less would be to invite further tragedy and undermine the values and ideals this Nation stands for.●

TEACHING VALUES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Baltimore Sun carried an article by Kathy Lally about teaching values and I think it is worthy of inclusion at this point in the RECORD. It shows that real progress can be made in this area consistent with all our American freedoms and liberties.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 18, 1983]

VALUES PANEL, BORN IN CONTROVERSY,
REPORTS IN HARMONY
(By Kathy Lally)

Teaching values. Once all the schoolmaster had to do was open his McGuffey's Reader to the page about George Washington and the cherry tree. Never cry wolf, another lesson said, and while you're at it, don't cry over spilled milk. Repeat often enough, and the lesson was learned.

A hundred years later, children had stopped believing they should be seen and not heard. What was right and what was wrong became a subject for debate in the 1960s, and George Washington was being replaced by survival games:

"You are the captain of a ship in the middle of the ocean. The ship is sinking, and you only have room for 5 of the 10 passengers in the lifeboat. Decide who will be allowed in the lifeboat."

Teaching values had become a matter of controversy, so it was no surprise that the creation of the Maryland Values Education Commission in January, 1979, was greeted in some quarters not as an affirmation of motherhood and apple pie but a possible threat to intellectual freedom.

Now, four years later, the commission—concerned about crime on the streets, corruption in government and disorder in the schools—has finished its work and given a report to the governor. For a group created

amid doubt and controversy, the report is perhaps remarkable for what it has not done.

It has offended no one with the list of 18 character and citizenship objectives ("You can't use the word 'values,'" says Mary Ann Kirk, the vice chairman. "It raises all sorts of red flags.") that should be taught in the schools. It has not come up with any specific program that schools should adopt. It has not angered teachers. The skeptics on the commission did not find it necessary to write a minority report.

What happened? Did 24 strong-willed people of differing religious and political persuasions negotiate themselves into platitudes?

"No," says Kris McGough, a parent activist from Howard county, who asked for an appointment to the board because she was afraid of what it might do. For a time she saw herself as the token conservative.

"I don't think it got watered down. I thought about it—will it come across as some real bland thing? Maybe because I know the infighting that went on, I don't think it's watered down."

Instead of recommending a specific program, which she says would have been an ineffective "quick fix," the commission looked at whole schools and came up with proposals to involve everyone in values education—"everyone from the janitor up," she says.

It stresses the importance of the principal and suggests increasing his stature, pay, training, and evaluation. It urges schools to draw up their own courses of study with parental and community involvement. It calls for more counselors. It says disruptive students should be removed from the classroom immediately.

It suggests training teachers and principals in motivation, discipline and the focus on values in the curriculum. It advises giving teachers greater responsibility, including teaching values in all courses from kindergarten through 12th grade and acting as role models both in and out of class. It wants the state to set up a resource center with staff members trained to help local districts start programs.

"There may have been some people who thought you could teach Ethics 101 and the problem would go away," says Richard Schifter, the commission chairman. He is a Washington lawyer, Potomac resident, a former president of the State Board of Education and chairman of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Human Rights Commission. "We have new problems in society, so the schools have a greater responsibility."

"Making the position of principal one of prestige and rewards is the backbone of the report," he says. "The position of principal, relatively speaking, has declined. We want to put him back in a leadership position."

"We've done a good job," says Mrs. Kirk, the woman who lobbied the legislature to create the commission. "We've created a starting point."

"We're saying to the local community, 'Will you please do something about this,'" says Rita S. Gordon, who is also a member of the Frederick County Board of Education. "And we're hoping they will."

"This gives the schools the blueprint to go through the same process we did," says Mrs. McGough. "I've talked to P-TAs. They think it would be useful just to have a forum to talk about these things."

"To me, what would have been a weak program would be to say the state should

develop a curriculum and force every school to use it. Quick fixes don't work. I think this is a process the communities have to go through. You're more apt to buy into something you've developed yourself."

Mrs. McGough was not always so optimistic about the effect of the commission.

"At first, I thought, 'Ye gods. This thing is going to be terrible.' At those early meetings I thought, 'Right now if we take a vote we'd have Sydney Simon running our schools.'"

Sydney Simon was the national proponent of values clarification, what Mrs. McGough calls the lifeboat school of values. "Values clarification—I don't care what you believe as long as you think it out," Mrs. McGough said. She did not want that taught in the schools.

Neither did Charles Obrecht, a partner in a Baltimore industrial development firm.

"What we are talking about is not using games and tricks," he says. "We want to teach kids using real-life experiences," he spoke approvingly of a recent Gilman School Program. The whole school went to see the movie "Gandhi," then discussed the issues it raised.

The commission members spent 6 months deciding on the 18 objectives. There was a year of visiting schools across the state. More time was spent holding hearings. And there were endless discussions, preliminary drafts and rewriting. As they worked, the commissioners were reimbursed only for mileage.

"Most commissions of this type hire full-time staffs," Mr. Schifter says. "We didn't. Every line was written by commission members. We met 11 times a year—44 half-days. Then we had subcommittee meetings in between. We met a total of 40 full days. That would be eight weeks. That's quite a bit of work for citizens to do all by themselves in eight weeks."

"People were always saying, 'My God, are you still meeting?'" Mrs. McGough recalls. "I'm glad we took that long. We didn't get rushed through it. I was afraid they would ram stuff through. But they didn't do it, even if it dragged on two years longer than it should have."

"People wondered what I had up my sleeve," says Mrs. Kirk. "I only wanted to find ways to help young people grow in a positive way."

She smarted from some perceptions of the commission as a bunch of do-gooders.

"Well, if you think I like being cast in a role as a moralist, looking down on other people, I don't," Mrs. Kirk says.

Mrs. Gordon started out with some fears that her rights as a parent might be infringed. "I didn't want someone teaching my children something I'm not teaching them," Mr. Gordon says. "I think this is something everyone can support."

"I was very concerned about it. One of the things that concerned me was that there would be a mandated curriculum."

"You can't mandate a specific curriculum," says Mrs. Kirk, who is a Montgomery county resident and president of the Center for Citizenship Education in Washington. "Every area is different."

The commission was able to defuse some early criticism from the Maryland State Teachers Association, the union representing 36,000 teachers.

"We thought they did an excellent job," said Janice A. Piccinini, the union president. "They had to walk a fine line in dealing with moral judgments. We think their citizen and character objectives are excellent."

The union was unhappy when the commission started talking about teachers volunteering more time, but was pleased when the members softened some stands. "They should be talking about everybody in the community volunteering to work with kids. Not just teachers."

And now the report awaits consideration by boards of education.

John C. Murphy, president of the Howard County Board of Education, says he has not yet read the final report, although he kept up with the commission's work as it went along.

He, for one, would have liked a specific program.

"At that point, most of the items were things we agreed with," Mr. Murphy said. "But we weren't sure how they intended us to go about it."

The Baltimore county superintendent says that's fine with him.

"Curriculum development has traditionally been within the domain of the local school systems," said Dr. Robert Y. Dubel. "They've done their job by concluding that public schools have a role in values education. Now it's up to us to flesh it out."

And it's not something that can be done just by going back to the McGuffey Reader, Dr. Dubel says.

Even the commission members, who are hoping for the best, do not expect miracles.

"I think we've come to see it will be a long, hard road," Mrs. Gordon says. "Most of us [school districts] have money problems. I'm not sure there's a whole lot we can do right now. I hope we can do it gradually."

"The cynics will say, 'Here we are, motherhood and apple pie, baseball and Chevrolets,'" Mrs. Gordon says. "Well, you have to be a little bit of an idealist or a Pollyanna to think if something's broken you can fix it."

"All I can say is, give us a chance. See if we can fix it."

RECOMMENDED VALUES CHARACTER OBJECTIVES

Personal integrity and honesty rooted in respect for the truth, intellectual curiosity and love of learning.

A sense of duty to self, family, school and community.

Self esteem rooted in the recognition of one's potential.

Respect for the rights of all persons regardless of their race, religion, sex, age, physical condition or mental state.

A recognition of the right of others to hold and express differing views, combined with the capacity to make discriminating judgments among competing opinions.

A sense of justice, rectitude and fair play, and a commitment to them.

A disposition of understanding, sympathy, concern and compassion for others.

A sense of discipline and pride in one's work; respect for the achievements of others.

Respect for one's property and the property of others, including public property.

Courage to express one's convictions.

CITIZENSHIP OBJECTIVES

Patriotism: love, respect and loyalty to the United States of America, the willingness to correct its imperfections by legal means.

An understanding of the rights and obligations of a citizen in a democratic society.

An understanding of other societies in the world which do not enjoy the rights and privileges of a democratic government.

Respect for the U.S. Constitution, the rule of law and the right of every citizen to

enjoy equality under the law. An understanding of the Bill of Rights and a recognition that all rights are limited by other rights and by obligations.

Respect for legitimate authority at the local, state and federal levels.

Allegiance to the concept of democratic government as opposed to totalitarian rule. A recognition that such government is limited by the separation of powers and by the countervailing role of other institutions in a pluralistic society—principally the family, religion, the school and private enterprise.

Recognition of the need for an independent court system to protect the rights of all citizens.

An acceptance of all citizenship responsibilities at the local, state and national levels, and a commitment to preserve and defend the United States and its democratic institutions.●

GOOD WILL OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune of coming across an incident that was very moving. It showed once again that the human spirit can overcome obstacles that appear insurmountable.

The following account of the incident was written by Comdr. Edmund Pinto of the Naval Reserve Office of Information, Detachment 206, Washington, D.C. Commander Pinto is also the Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs of the Federal Aviation Administration.

GOODWILL CRUISE OF U.S.S. "WILLIAM V. PRATT," DDG-44, TO CENTRAL AMERICA

I want to pay tribute to the men and women of our Armed Forces, but in particular to the crew of the U.S.S. *William V. Pratt*, a guided missile destroyer that recently returned from a goodwill visit to Central America, overcoming adversity and misfortune to carry out her vital mission of strengthening ties of friendship with our neighbors to the South.

Now, the U.S. Navy often sends our ships calling around the world on such missions. These visits are a mainstay of our policy of maintaining relations with friendly countries, all the while demonstrating to the world the enormous reservoir of goodwill, respect, and helpfulness this country has to offer.

But, this trip was different. A series of unforeseen problems aboard *William V. Pratt* nearly brought the mission to an untimely end before it could get started. Only the resiliency and ingenuity, seamanship and expertise of its captain and crew brought this mission to its successful conclusion.

And what a conclusion it was. The peoples of Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, Belize had the great fortune of meeting and working with the officers and men of this ship in numerous community relations, self-help projects undertaken by the crew. Our sailors rebuilt a flood-damaged pedestrian bridge connecting a poverty-stricken neighborhood from the city proper in Limon,

Costa Rica; a training school for homeless boys and girls in Tela, Honduras, was repainted, its furniture repaired and refinished, problems with plumbing corrected. Schools in Puerto Barrios, Guatemala, and Belize City, Belize, were painted and cleaned. In all cases, local citizens joined with our men in doing the work, and our boys provided a cookout for these local helpers and hundreds of children, most of whom probably never experienced a good, old-fashioned American hot dog and hamburger barbecue.

We also threw parties for orphaned kids on board the ship in each of the cities, donated clothing, medicine and food to the communities. Our men gave freely of souvenirs from the ship, their own monogrammed ballcaps and Navy white hats to admiring youngsters. They chatted, interacted, and demonstrated in the most outstanding manner just what sort of a people we are, a people whose hands extend outward in help to the less fortunate wherever they may be living. These projects left in their wake an enormous sense of pride on the part of our officers and men, but more importantly, a tremendous feeling of goodwill to the U.S. Navy and the United States on the part of the local residents.

But all of this almost didn't come to pass, and I'd like to tell you why, and I'd like the American people to know just how seasoned and resourceful a crew is serving abroad the U.S.S. *William V. Pratt*.

In order to tell this story I have to pay special respects to the so-called "snipes" aboard the ship. These are the men who work below in the oven-hot confines of the engineering spaces, for it was here that the problems manifested themselves, and it was here, after endless hours of backbreaking toil and debilitating sweat that they were resolved.

These snipes are made of the same stuff that history tells us made America great. These modern-day sailors demonstrated anew the strength of the American traditions of hard work and resolve to overcome all obstacles to get the job done. None of their predecessors, in the days when ships ran before the mast and seamanship often was measured by the muscles of the crew, worked any harder or under any more difficult conditions.

Under the leadership of CDR Robert Bell, the ship's captain, and LCDR. William D. Updegraff, the ship's engineer, the snipes of *William V. Pratt* worked around the clock, in hotly confined spaces, tearing apart piping and steam lines to find and repair the source of salt water contamination of fresh water that provides the steam to run her boilers.

The work was nearly unbearable, but they stuck to it. After one particularly tortuous 24-hour period of constant work in temperatures that could cook an egg, one of the snipes came topside to the mess decks for breakfast. Fatigue overcame hunger and as his shipmates looked on his body sagged and his head slowly fell to the table. He was sleeping.

But he and his colleagues had beaten this first trial and the ship, enroute to Costa Rica, continued rather than pull back into Guantanamo Bay Naval Base for major repair work. Their efforts were vital for without fresh water the boilers could not operate and the ship could not continue her journey.

Then came the second mishap. Without warning the insulation on a vital pump burned out, shorting its motor and once

more threatening to shut down the boilers. The engineering crew, the snipes, were called back to duty with scarcely a day's rest. Unable to repair the motor, they rigged a temporary fix that allowed *William V. Pratt* to continue its journey from Limon, Costa Rica, to Tela, Honduras, its next port of call.

And what of the remainder of the ship's crew during what were trying moments topside as the ship's speed dropped to levels that barely showed movement in the vast and unending seas. The rest of the crew put their uncertainties aside about whether they would even make the visits, and they continued to preen the ship to show it off in its best light. Constantly they worked, enmeshed in the routine toil and drudgery that has been a sailor's lot from time immemorial.

They chipped paint and rust and repainted the decks and bulkheads; they polished the brass and swept and swabbed in a seemingly endless counterpoint to the rolling and dipping motion of the ship as the sea's eternal symphony, the whispered breaking of waves, played against the ship's sides.

The heat and the glare of the unyielding Caribbean sun failed to halt the dabbling of Navy gray paint on the rails and bulkheads, or the broadstrokes of rollers dipped in black and spread on the decking.

The reports we've gotten back from our embassies in the countries visited by *William V. Pratt* show that the hardy efforts of this crew were not in vain. Each visit was declared immensely successful and an outstanding demonstration of U.S. goodwill. ●

EMMA LONG—CHAMPION OF WOMEN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, long before the women's movement was the topic of the day, Emma Long was a champion for women in Austin, Tex. In 1948, Emma Long became the first woman elected to the Austin City Council, a position she held for 16 years. Known as the "people's candidate," the councilwoman followed the philosophy that running a city was little different than running a household. During her 16 years in office, Long took the lead in appointing women to city commissions and boards and integrating city golf courses, libraries, and other public accommodations. She also was active in the Democratic Party and the League of Women Voters.

Long was born in the Texas Panhandle. She earned a history degree from the University of Texas at Austin, and after her marriage to Stuart Long, went to work at the Austin American-Statesman. Stuart Long became one of Texas' greatest newsmen and political analysts.

She and her husband founded Long News Service shortly after World War II and Long spent years as a reporter

in the Texas capitol. She was the first woman to cover the State capitol. The news service kept 26 daily newspapers, including the New York Times, apprised of legislative activities. The company is still going strong, and now produces five weekly newsletters on specialized subjects in addition to disseminating daily news. Long and her two sons retain half interest in the new service.

Although she is now retired, Emma Long is far from idle. She manages rental properties and a farm and is a well-known figure on the Austin social scene.

Recently, Long was honored by the Austin Professional Chapter of Women in Communications with the Banner Award for outstanding service as a community communicator.

In addition, an article about Long recently appeared in the Austin American-Statesman, which I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman]

PUBLIC'S OLD FRIEND: RETIRED POLITICIAN LONG HASN'T LOST HER TOUCH

(By Marilyn Kay Kuehler)

No matter how you perceive Emma Long, one thing is certain—at age 70, she is an Austin institution.

And if a group of her friends has its way, the City Council will have a chance to make it official.

The "Tribute to Emma Long" Committee, which includes honorary chairperson Lady Bird Johnson, wants a city park named after Long and will present the idea to the council Feb. 10.

"I think it would be a wonderful, marvelous tribute," Emma said. "I'm willing to accept it . . . I've had a love affair with Austin ever since 1931."

If you know anything at all about Austin, you know about Emma Long.

Scrappy and tenacious are the words used to describe the red-haired, flashing blue-eyed housewife who left her kitchen in 1948 to become the first woman elected to the Austin City Council.

Although few admitted casting a vote for her, Emma was re-elected to the council for 16 years. She gained the nickname "the people's candidate" even though she was a liberal in a conservative city.

Emma was the one you called if the neighbor's dog barked too loud, or if you were black or brown and the streets in your neighborhood needed paving. She answered her telephone at night and listened to complaints while she fixed supper.

When the Texas Legislature was in session, Emma—with her colorful clothes and oversized jewelry—was hard to miss at the Capitol as she helped her late journalist-husband Stuart collect information for their Long News Service.

Emma was born Feb. 29, 1912, to a Panhandle ranching family. She graduated with a history degree from the University of Texas in 1936, and married Stuart the same year. They had two sons, Jeb and Jeff. She worked briefly for the American-Statesman and after World War II was involved in the League of Women voters and the Democratic Party.

From there, she launched a tumultuous political career that was characterized, she said, by the popular phrase, "If you want anything done at City Hall, call Emma."

Ensnored in a spacious white stone house near 38½ Street, Emma Long is leading a low-profile life. She is surrounded by a tranquil mixture of antique and modern furniture, a vast collection of books and mementos, thriving African violets and enough memories to capture any visitor's attention.

She calls herself "a retired politician," and is filling her hours by managing her rental properties and Bastrop County farm, attending parties and the theater, visiting with her family and playing bridge once a week. "I also play poker every Friday night," she said.

But two of the things Emma cherishes the most are no longer part of her life: her husband and her public service.

Lanky, intense Stuart Long, whom Emma considered "an intellectual, almost a genius," died in February, 1977, of pneumonia after a long fight with lung cancer. "I was pretty depressed for two or three years after he died," she said. "We were great friends and lovers and partners. We did everything together."

Part of their private life was publicly displayed. Whenever Stuart showed up with a new bow tie, acquaintances knew that Emma had sewn another one to add to the 300-plus she'd already whipped up for him.

Stuart was an avid reader, mostly politics; Emma was passionate about Shakespeare. They had common beliefs and friends.

"I made a good home and gave him two beautiful children," she said. "I pleased him by going into his profession."

She wasn't irked when people assumed that Stuart called the shots when she served on the City Council. "It didn't bother me," she said. "I went right ahead and stood up for my principles and ideals."

She does admit that when she was a councilwoman, Stuart gave her something she needed most: "He always praised me. I never was a good public speaker. I didn't have the gift of gab that way. If I felt horrible about a speech, he'd say, 'You were wonderful.'"

Not everyone felt that way about Emma.

In 1948, she ran for the unexpired council term of Homer Thornberry. Her philosophy was that running a city is no different than keeping house. "The city," she was quoted at the time, "sweeps the streets, carries off the garbage, tends the sick and settles disputes among neighbors."

She still believes that, and it made a lot of sense to the voters.

"The Establishment was upset and astounded when I was first elected because I was a liberal, and being a woman made me an oddity," she said. Emma's younger son was just 6 weeks old and jokes were made in the council about "carrying in the potty," she said.

"But as time went on and they saw that my principles and ideals were not too far off, they accepted me," she said. "I was popular with the majority of people."

Of her accomplishments, Emma is proudest of her appointments of women to the Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation Board and racial integration of golf courses, libraries and public accommodations.

But she didn't accomplish anything without a fight.

She describes herself as "a very strong character, determined and aggressive." She used those "very definite assets" and in the process tangled with her opponents.

"Five mayors and four city managers," she said. "I went through them in a hurry."

But a lot of years have passed and the axes are buried, and besides, Emma said, "I never let my political philosophy make enemies for me. I didn't feel it was Christian."

Emma doesn't miss the limelight as much as she does "feeling useful."

"I don't like to be idle. I get lonely and I miss association with the general public. I'm not doing anything for humanity," she said. "But I'm retired. And you can't have your cake and eat it." ●

MEDICAL EXPENSE DEDUCTION ACT OF 1983

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I reintroduce today, along with our distinguished colleague, BILL ARCHER, the Medical Expense Deduction Act of 1983.

This legislation, which I first introduced in May of last year, will provide long overdue tax relief to parent or legal guardian by allowing them to deduct certain reasonable living expenses they incurred during their child's required medical treatment.

Under current law, only transportation costs are clearly defined as medical deductions and are available to taxpayers who accompany their child on out-of-town visits to a doctor, hospital, or clinic.

The purpose of this legislation is to expand the definition of a medical deduction, section 213(d) of the Internal Revenue Code, to include those meals and lodging expenses incurred by a parent, guardian, and minor child when traveling to receive medical care.

Although we are living in austere times, this bill is just and proper and is, in my judgment, the type of compassionate legislation which has become the hallmark of this the greatest deliberative body in the world.

In recent years, the Internal Revenue Code has been modified to provide taxpayers with new deductions for such things as adoption fees and child day care expenses. While these are worthy deductions, I cannot think of a more deserving group of individuals, for this type of tax treatment, than those parents or guardians who are facing the crushing economic burden and psychological strain of watching their child suffer from a debilitating disease.

In my own city of Houston, we have many excellent medical facilities including one of the finest cancer treatment centers in the entire Nation. As a result, hundreds of citizens travel to Houston so that their children can receive vital and life-saving cancer treatment. While this treatment does not always require actual hospitalization, it does require that the child be avail-

able on an outpatient basis for several consecutive days.

In fact, the University of Texas System Cancer Center recently conducted a survey which indicated that the average length of stay for its patients was 5½ days overall. According to this survey, clinic patients averaged 5 days, while stays associated with hospital admissions averaged 9 days.

As a result, many parents find themselves not only separated from the rest of their family but many times they suffer losses of income or jobs due to extended and recurrent trips out of their home town.

In addition, a parent or guardian may find these away-from-home living expenses reaching intolerable levels and may be faced with the unenviable prospect of abandoning a sick child in a hospital or face financial ruin. I do not believe any person should be forced to make such a decision and with the passage of this legislation no parent or guardian will ever have to make such a choice.

At the same time, it has been clearly demonstrated that parents and legal guardians provide not only irreplaceable comfort to these children, but actually assist in their child's medical care by insuring a proper diet, by providing medication, by assisting in physical therapy and by generally attending to their emotional needs which are so important to the overall success of their medical treatment.

At a child's most critical moment of need, a parent or guardian can and does make the difference between a stable period of medical treatment and one of unquestionable anxiety.

Many years ago, President John Kennedy in his book "Profiles of Courage" wrote of those Americans who by their actions changed the course of our Nation's history. While a severely ill child may never have the impact of these historical figures, in my judgment, they are the real heroes and their lives are the real profiles in courage. I do not believe anyone can ever visit a hospital like M.D. Anderson in Houston and not be deeply touched by the commitment to life and the sacrifices these children are willing to make for a better tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, this bill utilizes our Tax Code to assist a parent or guardian of these children in a realistic and cost-effective manner. The passage of this bill will not result in significant losses of Federal revenues and, in fact, has been drafted in recognition of our current deficit problems. For this reason, the bill only allows one parent or guardian to deduct meals and lodging expenses, it limits deductibility for children under the age of 18 and it restricts the deductions to expenses incurred outside an individual's home town. While this bill's revenue impact is limited, one should not underesti-

mate the importance and need for this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been endorsed by a number of organizations including the Association for the Care of Children's Health and the internationally known Candlelighters Foundation.

These groups share my belief that parents and guardians should be allowed to deduct certain limited living expenses on those occasions when it is necessary for them to accompany their sick child to a facility for required medical treatment.

While this bill does not attempt to deal with every hypothetical situation that may occur, it is my fervent hope that this legislation will serve as a focal point for discussion and that the Ways and Means Committee will address this critical need. I am convinced that if given an opportunity the House of Representatives will vote overwhelmingly to approve the Medical Expense Deduction Act of 1983.

Finally, I would like to compliment Senator LLOYD BENTSEN of Texas for introducing the companion version of this legislation and I would like to extend my personal thanks to Mr. John A. Townsend, a tax attorney in Houston, Tex., whose council and guidance have been invaluable in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity to address the House on this most pressing legislative matter. ●

THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1983

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, we recall in sorrow the Armenians who were the victims of the first genocide of the 20th century. Between 1915 and 1918, over 1½ million Armenians perished of starvation and butchery at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. For the past 13 years, on or around April 21, Members of Congress have set aside a day to commemorate and reflect upon this timeless tragedy.

Our remembrance and acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide is particularly fitting this year—1983 marks the commemoration of the Jewish Holocaust, and the U.S. Memorial Council has agreed to commemorate the Armenian genocide in its museum and in its educational programs. Nevertheless, Congress must continue to commemorate this event and be ever vigilant against those who would deny its truth or downgrade its horror. In August, an article by the Department of State raised serious questions about the U.S. Government's recognition of the historical veracity of this event. It stated that "the Department of State

does not endorse allegations that the Turkish Government committed a genocide against the Armenian people." Although the State Department subsequently issued a retraction of the statement, it failed to affirm the fact that the genocide occurred. Thus, our reaffirmation in Congress that this awful chapter in man's history did in fact occur is even more fitting this year. It is our responsibility to help keep this memory alive and vivid, so that the lessons of the past may never be forgotten, and so that our resolve to fight against the persecution and inhumanity of today will be strengthened.

Of the more than a half million Armenians in the United States today, most have a relative who was killed during the Armenian genocide. The Armenians have come far since those dark days. They have earned an invaluable place in American society, and our history is filled with numerous accomplishments of the Armenian community. I am proud they are a part of our Nation's heritage, and that I have had the opportunity to know Armenian Americans personally. Knowing many Armenian Americans personally as I do, I can understand the strong feelings of Armenians with respect to keeping the memory of this tragic massacre alive for future generations. I am certain that brutality and persecution will never daunt their inimitable spirit, one which has enabled them to overcome significant adversity, and forge a new life in this country. ●

UNFAIR PRODUCT LIABILITY STANDARDS

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, American consumers and manufacturers bear an unnecessary burden because of the inconsistent and often unfair product liability standards applied around the country.

As the laws are presently written, small businesses are threatened by the staggering costs of product liability litigation. These suits affect not only manufacturers but retailers and distributors as well. Because of the great costs, many "mom and pop" businesses have a difficult time paying for the defense of a product liability suit. Even if they are found not liable, the businesses may still pay heavily in legal fees.

But the affects do not end with businesses. The enormous costs of product liability suits are passed on to each of us as consumers in the higher prices we pay for goods. This situation must not continue. It is time we take careful

look at this legal crisis and establish a sense of order through national product liability guidelines.

A number of features of the present system work against the best interests of consumers. In California and New York, for example, design improvements made by a manufacturers after an accident can be introduced in court as evidence that the original product was defective. This has a chilling effect on efforts to make products safer through use of new knowledge and advanced technology. Companies in these States run the risk of being punished for improving the safety of their products. Federal guidelines for product liability will eliminate disincentives for making products safer.

Federal guidelines will also benefit consumers by providing greater predictability. Consumers need to know their rights and the obligations of manufacturers. And, by providing clear standards, Federal guidelines would promote prompt resolution of claims.

Now set at the State level, product liability law varies widely from one jurisdiction to the next. Only 32 States even have product liability statutes. None of these State laws is comprehensive and no two are identical.

Yet, manufacturers in the United States ship 70 percent of their products out of State and many sell their goods nationwide. This means that many American manufacturers face the impossible task of meeting 50 different product liability standards. It is difficult under these circumstances to know which standards to follow when making a product.

Furthermore, a number of recent court decisions have departed from all traditional notions of liability. For example, the highest court in New Jersey ruled that a company can be held liable for product-related injuries even though scientific knowledge at the time of the product's manufacture and sale could not have established any danger. And, courts in several States have held that a manufacturer may be liable for injuries without proof that the company actually made the product. This trend toward absolute liability—which holds manufacturers liable for defects in product design or inadequate warning even though reasonable care was taken—unduly punishes many businesses.

While a manufacturer which sells a defective product or fails to provide adequate warnings should be liable when at fault, increasingly, manufacturers are held accountable for irresponsible actions by the product user. In Maryland, for example, a laundry dryer exploded when two men stuffed a hot air balloon into the machine. In spite of their reckless use of the dryer, the men were awarded \$855,000.

Moreover, the present product liability system places American manufacturers at a disadvantage with foreign competitors who are free from excessive product liability costs in their home markets. If unchecked, product liability may jeopardize a major portion of the American manufacturing community.

Product liability is a growing concern. Since 1974, the number of product liability suits filed in Federal courts has increased by more than 500 percent. Product liability reform is long overdue.

I am pleased, therefore, to join Ms. MIKULSKI in introducing a bill to establish clear Federal standards for product liability cases.

Our bill, the Product Liability Act of 1983, was first introduced in the last session. It is the product of extensive counsel by product liability authorities and technical advice from the entire spectrum of the manufacturing community. This bill would provide federally preemptive rules that make sense, in place of the chaotic patchwork that exists now.

The bill would also place responsibility on the person in the best position to avoid harm. By providing that manufacturers would be liable when they are at fault, the bill encourages the design, manufacture, and distribution of safe and improved products. In a number of States, product liability law neither properly allocates responsibility nor provides incentives for accident prevention.

During his term in office, President Carter proposed uniform guidelines for product liability to bring consistency to the courts across the Nation. And now, President Reagan has voiced his support for a Federal product liability law.

I urge my colleagues to join Ms. MIKULSKI and me in support of this bill that would replace the current system with Federal guidelines to insure consistency, promote product safety, reduce transaction costs, and provide fair compensation for injured persons.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following section-by-section summary of our legislation:

The explanation of the act follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION EXPLANATION OF THE PRODUCT LIABILITY ACT OF 1983

§ 1. Title. Product Liability Act of 1983.

§ 2. Findings and Purposes. Provides findings and purposes underlying need for legislation.

§ 3. Definitions.

(1) Commerce. Defines to apply full Commerce Clause authority.

(2) State. Defines to include possessions, territories, etc.

(3) Person. Defines very broadly and includes any Federal, State or local governmental entity.

(4) Product. Defines to include any "object or substance." Expressly excludes human tissue, organs, or blood and its components.

(5) Product liability action. Defines to include any claim or action brought by a claimant against a product seller for harm caused by a product. Includes, but is not limited to, actions, previously based on strict liability in tort, negligence, breach of warranty, misrepresentation, concealment, or non-disclosure "(whether intentional, negligent or innocent)," manufacturer's liability, products liability, or otherwise.

(6) Claimant. Defines to include persons harmed and their legal representatives.

(7) Harm. Defines to include damage to property (other than product itself), and personal physical injuries (including death), pain or mental harm suffered by claimant resulting from personal physical injuries. Expressly excludes commercial loss.

(8) Manufacturer. Defines to include any wholesaler, distributor or retailer who "plays a significant role" in designing, producing, altering, modifying, etc. the aspect of the product which injures claimant. Excludes one who distributes a product, and who also assembles, prepares, etc. the product in accordance with instructions, etc. of manufacturer.

(9) Product seller. Defines broadly. Excludes sellers of realty (except if the person is engaged in the mass production and sale of standardized dwellings), providers of professional services, and persons acting only in a financial capacity who are not manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors or retailers.

(10) Representation. Defines to mean an explicit statement, affirmation of fact, promise or description.

(11) Feasible. Defines to mean practicable and reasonable within generally acceptable technical and scientific knowledge, which is available, adequately demonstrated and economically reasonable for use and sale, at time of manufacture.

(12) Preponderance of the evidence. Defines to provide a more probable than not standard.

(13) Clear and convincing evidence. Defines to require proof necessary to produce firm conviction as to allegations sought to be established. States that requisite proof is greater than preponderance of evidence, but less than beyond a reasonable doubt.

(14) Known/Knowledge. When imputed to a person other than an individual, defines to mean that a natural person in a reasonable position to assess the significance of information is aware of that information.

§ 4. (a) Preemption. Supersedes federal and state law to the extent such law is inconsistent with the Act.

(b) Federal Jurisdiction. Does not vest subject matter jurisdiction in federal district courts.

§ 5. Standards of Responsibility for Manufacturers.

(a)(1) Generally. For liability to obtain against a manufacturer, trier of fact is required to find by preponderance of evidence that—

The product was unreasonably dangerous in construction;

The product was unreasonably dangerous in design;

The product was unreasonably dangerous because of a failure to provide adequate warnings or instructions; or

The product was unreasonably dangerous because it did not conform to manufacturer's representation, and that the unreasonably dangerous aspect of product was the proximate cause of harm; and that the defendant manufactured the product.

(a)(2) Collateral Estoppel. No offensive collateral estoppel.

(a)(3) Expert Testimony. Expert testimony is sufficient evidence only if corroborated by substantial objective evidence based on generally accepted scientific or technical knowledge.

(b) Construction Defects. To establish a construction defect, the product must be shown to deviate (1) from design or performance standards or (2) from otherwise identical units, and that the deviation created an unreasonable risk of harm.

(c) Design Defects. To establish a design defect, an alternative design must be shown to have been available, which on balance would have been "better" than the chosen design (defined to mean less likely to cause harm both as to the alleged hazard and as to overall protection from harm; neither more expensive nor less useful or desirable unless warranted by the added protections from harm; and not in violation of statutes, regulations, or mandatory safety standards), and which would have been capable of preventing claimant's harm.

A manufacturer shall not be liable for harm caused by uses other than those expected of an ordinary person; by alterations or modifications other than those expected of an ordinary person; or by aspects of a product not feasible of being made safe.

(d) Failure to Warn. To establish liability for failure to warn or instruct, it must be shown that danger or safety information was available to the manufacturer; was "reasonably necessary" (which is defined to refer to information concerning significant dangers which would be useful to persons likely to use the product other than information with respect to obvious or known dangers, unimportant dangers, uses other than those that would be reasonably expected of an ordinary person, or uses associated with alteration of modifications that would not be expected of an ordinary person); was not effectively provided to an "appropriate person" (defined to mean the product user, if feasible; a person reasonably expected to pass them on to the product user; in the case of certain products, an expert legally authorized to use them; in the case of products used in a workplace, the employer or person having custody of the product; in the case of components, raw materials or bulk products, the manufacturer's immediate vendee); and if provided, the warnings would have prevented the claimant's harm. Similar rules apply in case of post-manufacture duty to warn, except the manufacturer will not be liable if it made reasonable efforts to provide information to an appropriate person.

(e) Representation. To establish liability for non-conformance with a representation, claimant must show reliance on, and the untruth of, the representation. Negligence or fraud need not be shown.

§ 6. Standards for Product Sellers (Other Than Manufacturers).

(a)(1)-(2) General. Seller may be liable only if preponderance of evidence shows that product was proximate cause, that product seller failed to use reasonable care with respect to product, and that product seller sold the individual product unit involved. Seller must have known of danger that harmed claimant or have had an opportunity to inspect which would have revealed danger.

(b) Representations. Seller may be liable for its representations.

(c) Exception for Liability. Seller may be liable if manufacturer cannot be located or is not subject to process or if court deter-

mines that a judgment against manufacturer will probably be unenforceable.

(d) Collateral Estoppel. No offensive collateral estoppel.

§ 7. Government Standards and Contract Specifications.

(a)(1) Use by Claimant—Design Standards. If product seller did not comply with mandatory federal government standards, the product will be considered unreasonably dangerous unless it is proved by clear and convincing evidence that failure to comply was reasonably prudent conduct under circumstances.

(a)(2) Use by Manufacturer—Design Standards. If product seller proves compliance with mandatory federal government standards, product will not be considered unreasonably dangerous unless claimant proves by clear and convincing evidence that standards were unsound.

(b) Mandatory Government Contract Specifications. Substantial compliance with mandatory federal, state, or local government contract specifications redesign or instructions protects product seller from liability, unless the product was available commercially.

(c) Warnings or Instructions. Warnings or instructions are included within conduct covered by subsections (a) and (b).

§ 8. Evidence of Post-Manufacturing Improvements. Evidence of precautionary measures taken after date of manufacture is not admissible, except when used to impeach a witness who denies the feasibility of precautionary measures or when offered by the person who took the measure.

§ 9. Comparative Responsibility/Misuse or Alteration. Provides for pure comparative responsibility. Trier of fact determines the total amount of damages, and apportions responsibility among all persons responsible, including claimant. A *de minimis* rule excepts persons with insignificant responsibility from apportionment. Provides a special apportionment rule for responsibility of employers and co-employees. Comparative responsibility includes product misuse, alterations or modifications, improper maintenance, and use of a worn-out product. Judgment to be entered severally against parties liable; upon motion of claimant, obligations uncollected for pecuniary reasons may be reallocated only among joint tortfeasors.

§ 10. Effects of Workers' Compensation Benefits. Provides that damages otherwise recoverable are to be reduced by workers' compensation benefits. No subrogation, indemnity, contribution or lien from product seller unless agreed to. Provision for adjustment where products liability action decided prior to workers' compensation claim. No third-party action over against employer. Does not affect indemnity agreements. Repeals "dual capacity" doctrine.

§ 11. Punitive Damages. After a determination of the product seller's liability for actual damages and the amount thereof, on motion, the court may determine whether punitive damages should be awarded, and the amount thereof. Punitive damages shall be awarded only if a product seller acted with "reckless disregard," defined as a flagrant indifference to consumer safety indicating an extreme departure from accepted practice. A choice among competing designs or warnings, when made in the ordinary course of business, does not constitute reckless disregard. In determining punitive damages, the court shall consider the likelihood that serious harm would arise; the extent of the product seller's awareness of such likelihood; the profitability of the misconduct;

the duration of the misconduct and any concealment thereof; the attitude and conduct of the product seller's officers upon discovery of the misconduct; the financial condition of the product sellers; the total effect of other punishment imposed on the product sellers; and whether claimant acted in reckless disregard of his own safety. Punitive damages for any one claimant shall not exceed twice the amount of actual damages and in no event shall exceed \$1 million. With respect to all claimants, punitive damages and prior fines shall not exceed the lesser of \$5 million of net worth.

§ 12. (a) Statute of Limitations. Claims must be brought within two years of the time they were discovered or should have been discovered.

(b)-(d) Statute of Repose. Provides a 10-year statute of repose which commences on the date of first sale. However, in the event that the manifestation of the harm is delayed, or in the event of intentional misrepresentation by a product seller, a 15-year statute of repose is applicable. Also, a product seller may extend these time limitations in writing. These time limits are not applicable to actions for contribution or indemnity.

§ 13. Miscellaneous. Severance clause.

§ 14. Miscellaneous. Effective 60 days after enactment, applying to all actions commenced on or after that date. Notwithstanding the foregoing, all claimants able to bring an action on the effective date under prior law may commence an action under the Act within one year of its effective date.●

ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1983

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity once more to bring to the attention of our colleagues the genocide carried out against the Armenian people in 1915.

Little over a week ago I spoke to a Jewish congregation in Peoria, Ill., on the 40th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising by Jews against the Nazis. I reminded my audience that the lesson to be learned from the Holocaust is one that should be learned not only by Jews but by all civilized human beings: When uncontested state or ideological power is allowed to carry out its ends undisturbed, innocent people suffer and die. This is the iron law of history.

I mention this fact because there seems to be some confusion over the meaning of the commemoration of the victims of the genocide carried out against the Armenians in 1915. This is not an attempt to place blame or point fingers or cast up things that are best forgotten. No, it has a more positive aspect—it reminds all of us, whether we are of Armenian ancestry or not, that what happened in 1915 cannot be allowed to happen again to anyone. By the phrase "what happened" I mean the slaughter of innocents for political purposes. It does not matter, in the final analysis, what the name of the victim is or what his persecutor's name

is—what matters is that we should learn from the past so that we will not repeat its errors—or its atrocities.

So I look upon this day not as an exercise in blaming or vengeance or hate, but as an exercise in remembering, in learning, in reminding ourselves that free men and women remain free—and alive—only so long as they realize that undefended freedom is endangered freedom, that respect for the rights of others means first of all respect for and willingness to defend one's own rights as well, that wherever there is a victim of the unrestricted power of a government or ideology, civilization itself is under attack.

I make this report to our colleagues because I think it is good for all of us to know that we have to do more than remember the victims of persecutions. That is the easy part. We have to learn from their tragic fate, we have to live our lives in such a way that our defense of freedom and of our values gives some meaning to their agonies.

And, so Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to remember the Armenians. Nothing can change history. Those who were once enemies can become partners—perhaps even friends—against a common foe. We can change the present and the future if we are willing to learn from the past. It is up to us.●

PROBLEMS FACING U.S. AGRICULTURE

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, of all the many pressing issues this Congress will be addressing during the coming months, some of the more crucial will have to do with agriculture. With increasing regularity, we are faced with unsurmountable evidence that the problems confronting U.S. agriculture are structural. The amazing productivity of the American farmer has led to mounting surpluses that threaten to overwhelm the conventional sources of demand for food, feed, and fiber, and the search for balance is driven not just by the desire to end the billions of dollars of taxpayer outlays required to pay for land idling and surplus commodity storage, but also to reduce the growing pressures on the international trading system.

Perhaps never before has the need for farsighted changes in agricultural policy been so urgent. There has always been a great deal of discussion about how new domestic outlets for domestic agricultural production can be encouraged with a minimum of Government interference, and in a cost effective way, but today, those new outlets are needed as part of a

structural reorientation of American agriculture. The objective must be to stimulate new value added processing industries that will utilize U.S. agricultural production in a way that benefits consumers, producers, and taxpayers alike by providing demand for fuel and chemical outlets, in addition to the conventional food, feed, and fiber.

A recent analysis of some of the perceived changes in Soviet agricultural policy since Yuriy Andropov's rise to power is worthy of consideration in this regard. In a recent Pro Farmer article, a highly regarded Soviet analyst noted that changes in Moscow's approach to agriculture point to a "live-stock policy emerging which counts on domestically grown feeds, possibly supplemented by high protein concentrates as the best for the maintenance of these animals." To some, this may appear to be yet a further exacerbation of our current export problems, in which past customers are moving further away from consumption of excess U.S. production. However, this change in policy could actually afford the United States an opportunity that could enable us to contribute toward a number of important national objectives simultaneously. This opportunity should not be lost.

As the attached article printed in last summer's Foreign Affairs magazine points out, a U.S. fuel ethanol industry would provide our agricultural policy-makers with a new degree of much-needed flexibility. By converting the starch portion of U.S.-produced corn and other grains into a high grade liquid fuel (ethanol), while still preserving all of the original protein, vitamins, and minerals, U.S. grain undergoes a value-added process that meets both United States, and Soviet—or any other trading partners'—needs. The concentrated—one-third the weight—high protein coproduct is an excellent animal feeding material, and its transportation and storage is far more efficient than that of the bulk grain. The United States benefits by the production of a high grade liquid fuel extender and octane enhancer, increased economic activity and jobs, and improved trade flexibility, and the Soviets and other United States customers benefit from a concentrated feeding product that more efficiently suits their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to my colleagues' attention as we begin to focus on the crucial agricultural policy questions in the weeks to come.

The article follows:

[From Foreign Affairs, Summer 1982]

MORE BANG FOR THE BUSHEL

To the Editor:

Karl-Eugen Wadekin's Spring 1982 look at "Soviet Agriculture's Dependence on the West" was a thought-provoking analysis that should be required reading for U.S. agricultural policymakers of all stripes. While

it is certainly lamentable, there can be little doubt that American agriculture's profitability under the current method of "doing business" is heavily dependent upon sales to Moscow.

In analyzing what to expect in the way of Soviet grain purchases for the next five or more years, Mr. Wadekin acknowledges that Moscow will try very hard to cut down on food imports and speculates that the American farmer will find his market reduced thereby within a few years.

Such a scenario is not hard to envision. As a result of the grain embargo imposed by President Carter in response to the invasion of Afghanistan existing grain trade agreements with the Soviet Union have been upset and the embargo has relegated the United States to the position of a supplier of last resort. Further exacerbating the dissolution of Soviet reliance on long-term U.S. grain sales are the Reagan Administration's current efforts to induce tight credit restriction policies vis-a-vis Moscow. Continued reliance on the Soviets as an outlet for U.S. farmers overproduction will lead more often than not to excessive grain surpluses, with the attendant surge in federal price supports and storage costs, and worsened balance of trade.

Beyond the economic costs of a continued dependence on Soviet/East bloc grain import demand, there are also significant political and foreign policy costs. Due to the importance of key farm-bloc supporters in the Congress, for instance, the Reagan Administration has been unable to take the full range of actions (including another grain embargo) against the Soviet Union for its role in the brutalization of Poland. Our European allies have cited the decision not to end U.S. grain shipments as part of the reason for their refusal to comply with suggested U.S. sanctions against the Siberian natural gas pipeline.

Obviously, it would make good sense for the United States to commit itself to developing alternative outlets for U.S. grain production. Mr. Wadekin's article did reveal one dimension of Soviet agriculture that offers a significant opportunity for the United States to create greater U.S. grain trade flexibility.

Mr. Wadekin's revelation is that "the Soviet Union lacks protein feed. . . To compensate for the declining percentage of forage and dry roughage and increased quantities of grain feed, protein additives should be more than doubled." This need for increased protein additives could easily be met by U.S. exports in a way that would greatly increase U.S. flexibility, stabilize farm income, create jobs and productive investment and, not incidentally, provide a high-grade alternative liquid fuel capable of "backing our" crude oil imports on at least a one-for-one basis. This could be achieved by assuring that a portion of all grain bound for the Soviet Union—and elsewhere—was first processed into alcohol fuel and its high-protein co-products.

The production of ethanol from grain is steadily increasing today in the United States; last year, hundreds of millions of gallons of ethanol-enhanced fuel were consumed by American motorists. What is not widely known is that, in utilizing grain as the feedstock for fuel alcohol production, only the starch is consumed. The resultant high-protein co-products have been widely proven to be superior food and feed materials. One 56-pound bushel of corn, for example, when processed by a "wet-milling" facility, yields, in addition to over 2.5 gallons of

anhydrous ethanol, the following: 1.7 pounds of corn oil; 3 pounds of corn gluten meal (a 60 percent protein product in great demand by the broiler and layer industries); 14.3 pounds of corn gluten feed (a 21 percent protein material, nearly 3 million tons of which were exported last year to the European Economic Community by U.S. producers); and 15 pounds of highgrade carbon dioxide. In a "dry milling facility, besides the 2.5 gallons of ethanol, nearly 17 pounds of a 26 to 32 percent protein material called Dried Distillers Grain (DDG) remain after the process.

It is important to note two things about these high protein co-product streams of fuel alcohol production. First, they are superior for use as protein additives for animal feeding purposes. Second, they offer the needed nutrition performance while requiring only one-third the space and weight capacity of the bulk grain, (for corn, 18 pounds of co-products as compared to 56 pounds per bushel of bulk corn.) The Soviet Union's paucity of train storage and handling capacity makes this concentration effect of great value indeed.

In this process, the United States will have achieved multiple objectives. The most important include:

(1) *Adding a new dimension of flexibility to U.S. agricultural income and trade.* By first extracting the valuable liquid fuel from a portion of its grain exports, the American farmer can receive significant returns for the ethanol from each bushel, even if Moscow's demand for the feed portions were to decline or be cut off entirely. In the event of an unexpected disruption in trade, the concentrated nature of the high-protein co-product would facilitate storage and lower costs when compared to that required for bulk grains.

(2) *Significantly improving the U.S. balance of trade.* The use of the fuel alcohol domestically would reduce crude oil imports on at least a one-to-one basis. In addition, the sales of the high-protein co-product would generate revenue.

(3) *Stimulating an orderly redirection toward the processing of bulk commodities in the United States rather than recipient countries.* Thus, more American jobs are created, state and federal tax bases are expanded, and a solid infrastructure for future industrial development is established. (It has been estimated that, if only ten percent of the \$8.7-billion worth of corn exported by the United States last year were "processed" into wet corn milling products for export, business activity would increase by \$7.734 billion, creating 165,300 more jobs and raising personal income in the United States by \$1.713 billion.)—DAVID E. HALLBERG, President, Renewable Fuels Association, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Wadekin replies:

Regarding Mr. Hallberg's comments, it is true that a higher protein content would greatly improve the average Soviet feeding ration, but it is also true that Soviet animal farms' demand for feed grain would thereby be reduced still more than envisaged in my article. As to transport and storage costs and facilities in the Soviet Union for imported proteinic co-products of fuel alcohol production, these should not be compared to bulk grains but to soybeans and their meals and other comparable commodities. These also figure high in Soviet feedstuff imports, and are likely to expand further, although they are similarly limited by transport and storage facilities and also by

the capacities of the vegetable oil and mixed feed industries of the Soviet Union.

Insofar as these limits apply to fuel alcohol co-products as well, the two kinds of protein additives would be competitors in a market which, although big, is limited. According to Mr. Hallberg, the protein content of fuel alcohol co-products is yet higher; in addition, Mr. Hallberg claims that these require less processing capacities for turning them into livestock feed. To the degree that such advantages exist, potential for an expansion of U.S. exports of feedstuff of this kind, combined with the preceding use for fuel production, indeed seems to exist, and American suppliers may have a technological edge over others. However, for the reasons outlined before, one should not overestimate the net effect on the American farm sector and its exports. And after all, I did not say that overall Soviet grain purchases will sizably ebb earlier than the mid-1980s. ●

"SECRET" WAR AGAINST NICARAGUA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for over 1 year, evidence has been accumulating that the United States is involved in a covert operation, training, and arming counterrevolutionaries in Honduras for a secret war against Nicaragua. Recent press reports have exposed this operation in glaring detail.

I would like to submit for the record just one series of the many articles that have appeared in the last month concerning U.S. involvement along the Honduran-Nicaraguan border. Washington Post correspondent Christopher Dickey spent 6 days with these counterrevolutionaries. His reports show that these forces are being led by former members of Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza's National Guard. They are well armed with weapons supplied by the United States, and openly proclaim their reliance on the United States. The avowed purpose of their escalating incursions into Nicaragua is to violently overthrow the Nicaraguan Government.

While there continues to be uncertainty about the intent of U.S. policy in the region, its effects are becoming increasingly clear. The U.S. involvement with these forces is undermining the prospects for peace and democracy in the region, and is violating our own laws, treaty obligations, and principles. I urge my colleagues to read these and other reports carefully, and do all they can to bring an end to this dangerous policy.

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, Apr. 3, 1983]

TOUGH FORMER GUARDSMEN LEAD INSURGENTS AGAINST SANDINISTAS

WELL-ARMED UNITS SHOW STRONGHOLDS

(By Christopher Dickey)

ARENALES, NICARAGUA.—Long lines of soldiers appeared suddenly on the sharp mountain ridges leading to this valley deep in Nueva Segovia province. They were rising from the cover of all-night ambush positions guarding their camp, more than 400 of them, part of elite rebel units fighting the leftist Sandinista government of Nicaragua.

Small landowners and local country people for the most part, the troops are commanded by tough professional soldiers from the old National Guard of the dictatorship of Anastasio Somoza, who was ousted by the Sandinistas in 1979. For the first time last week, the counterrevolutionaries brought two U.S. reporters here in the midst of heavy fighting to lift some of the cloak from their long-secret war.

For six days and more than 90 miles through the broken mountains, pasturelands and tropical forests of Nueva Segovia, we moved with units of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, the largest and richest of Nicaragua's counterrevolutionary groups. The conditions set for the visit were that we would not reveal the exact way that we entered Nicaragua or the location of any major base camps.

These guerrilla units, under the field command in this region of a former National Guard first sergeant they call "Suicide," appeared to be as well trained and well armed as virtually any regular infantry in Central America. The antennas of U.S. field radios waved above many shoulders. Others bore U.S. grenade launchers, U.S. .30-caliber machine guns. Some wore U.S. boots, packs and belts. They hoisted sophisticated U.S. light antitank weapons.

One squad commander said he was graduated less than a month ago from a 65-day course in leadership and tactics taught by six Argentine colonels in a special school outside the Honduran capital. Many other soldiers said they were trained initially in Honduran border camps, where units of about 200 men each were prepared for combat.

None said where his Belgian-made FAL automatic rifles came from, but such guns were standard issue to the Honduran Army before the United States began reequipping it with M16 rifles in the past two years.

Charges of U.S., Argentine and Honduran backing for the rebellion against Nicaragua's Sandinista government have long been the subject of news leaks and angry diplomatic exchanges. U.S. officials have refused comment on the reports. For soldiers in the field, however, such backing is a given—and considered by them to be their most important advantage in the struggle with the Sandinistas.

Already seasoned by months of combat, they had fought eight hours the day we joined the main force. They would fight until after dark the next day as well, with full firepower of three companies brought to bear against Sandinista Army units seeking out positions nearby.

Their morale was high. With the United States behind them—"the most powerful country in the world," as some liked to describe it—many of the rebels said they believe they cannot lose.

Having turned these mountains into what they call "enemy territory for the Sandinis-

tas," counterrevolutionary commanders said they hope within a matter of weeks to take and hold a major town in the region, probably the dusty little garrison of Jalapa, a few miles south of the Honduran border.

This could open the way for recognition and resupply by land and air. The guerrillas' fierce optimism about this is shared by some of the Hondurans who have helped the anti-Sandinistas, despite the possibility that such a move might provoke open hostilities between Nicaragua and the U.S.-backed Honduran Army.

"We are ready for that," one well-informed Honduran officer said in that country's capital last week after a meeting with other commanders. "I don't think there's any secret in this anymore. It's a question of you or me."

There is concern, however, that Washington might try to pull back from its vital support of these troops if the situation gets too explosive.

"The United States is helping us in a way we don't want. They are saying no, no, no to everything. Our men want to do spectacular things," complained one counterrevolutionary political leader outside Nicaragua who was instrumental in setting up our visit. "You have the momentum, and they stop you. It's like an invisible hand holding strings."

As did his men on the ground here, he dismissed the Reagan administration's assertion to Congress that Washington's support for the anti-Sandinistas is intended essentially to cut the Nicaraguan government's arms supplies to insurgents in El Salvador.

"The people who are fighting, they are not fighting to stop the weapons," the counterrevolutionary leader said. "We are fighting to liberate Nicaragua."

As Suicide put it here in the middle of the war zone, "We're not going to stop the transport of arms and supplies to the Salvadoran guerrillas or the Guatemalan guerrillas until we cut the head off the Sandinistas."

The counterrevolutionaries express little ideological or political coherence, beyond an intense desire to rid the country of what they call communist influence and eliminate its present leadership. The leaders appear to hope that just as in the 1979 insurrection against the Somoza dictatorship, Nicaraguans will unify against what they say is a bad government even if they are not sure what will replace it.

They count on touching an insurrectionary nerve that they believe runs deep through Nicaraguan history and society, and they say that while U.S. aid undoubtedly helps them, they will continue fighting even if it is cut off.

"This is not the second civil war that Nicaragua has had. We've had dozens of them," said Nicaraguan Democratic Force political leader Adolfo Calero. "Whether there is U.S. support or there is not U.S. support will not make the difference of whether there is fighting or no fighting in Nicaragua... but whether it will be a long bloody affair that will destroy the country or whether it will be quick."

As the threat of counterrevolution has mounted, the Nicaraguan government repeatedly has focused on the possibility of an invasion from Honduras, describing it as something that might be fought in an almost classic war of fronts. But what has happened is a massive infiltration.

"I'm breaking new ground every day," said Suicide, whose real name is Pedro Pablo

Ortiz Centeno. "They won't get me out of here now."

A short, hard man, 32 years old with a mustache and goatee that give his features a vaguely oriental aspect, this guerrilla warlord of Nueva Segovia claims to have almost 2,000 men under his command. In neighboring Madriz and Jinotega provinces and down into Matagalpa and Boaco the counterrevolutionaries claim thousands—and there are almost certainly hundreds—more armed men. In the forests and jungles of the isolated Atlantic Coast, meanwhile, an allied force of Miskito and other Indians is said to be at least as large and well armed.

As we traveled more than 30 miles inside Nicaraguan territory in several incursions, we were able to talk to scores of counterrevolutionaries, their commanders and many peasants under relatively relaxed circumstances in protected campsites. We also saw the troops in heavy combat.

While the Sandinistas have been trying with extensive help from East Bloc countries to transform their guerrilla force of four years ago into one of the biggest regular armies in Central America, members of the National Guard that they defeated have made a much more successful and rapid transition to the role of guerrillas.

On the road in the Arenales area, for instance, near the Sandinista redoubts at El Doradito and Murra, Suicide stationed several ambushes to guard our approach. When more than a company of government troops caught sight of us moving through open ground and tried to intercept us at the road crossing, Suicide's men hit them head on.

Grenade, bazooka and mortar explosions echoed for miles through the hills. But Suicide's main units held their ground, reporting not a single serious casualty as they remained in position until nightfall picking off Sandinista soldiers trying to recover the dead, the wounded and their guns.

In official propaganda, the Sandinistas call the Democratic Force troops "genocidal guardsmen," or "beasts," or "Somicistas," resurrecting the nightmarish repression of the final days of the Somoza dictatorship when the Nicaraguan National Guard bombed civilian populations and summarily executed men and boys in the streets of Managua.

"They say we are National Guard, and that's true," Suicide remarked in the reference to 16 of his key aides. "But today things have changed." The Sandinistas, he said, "don't know what to make of us."

The counterrevolutionaries led by Suicide appeared to count on considerable and invaluable support among the few peasants left in the increasingly deserted war zone. The locals, some of whom are related to rebel soldiers, sold provisions to the troops with which we traveled, sheltered them and often provided them with intelligence about Sandinista movements.

When the Sandinistas came to power in 1979 they did so with remarkable speed at the head of a broad-based popular uprising against a hated dictator who was undermined on all sides and had even lost the support of Washington.

Faced with forces like those in Nueva Segovia, it appears likely that the Sandinistas' fight to consolidate their power may be longer and perhaps just as bloody as the revolution itself.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1983]

REBELS WANT U.S. TO DECLARE SUPPORT OPENLY

(By Christopher Dickey)

The exiled Nicaraguan political leaders tied to guerrillas fighting to overthrow their country's leftist Sandinista government decided last month to open up their long-secret war to the public partly out of fear that the covert backing of the United States would be cut the moment they began to make serious headway in their fight.

Speaking privately, several of them expressed deep reservations about the covert support from Washington—"the invisible hand," as some call it—that has helped create their movement but also could be used to destroy it. They say that a point has been reached, or soon will be, at which there is no turning back and the war cannot be stopped.

They are deeply bothered, however, by the example of the Bay of Pigs invasion against Cuba more than 20 years ago, when U.S. promises and understandings with the rebel force were broken, in their view. More recently, they look with consternation at the example of the Kurds in Iraq supported by the shah of Iran and the United States, then cut off when limited political gains were achieved.

By allowing two reporters to travel with their troops inside Nicaragua, the leaders of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force hoped to establish themselves as a credible fighting force with real potential to overthrow the Sandinistas and to dispel the ideas that they are mere agents of U.S. policy or desperate exiles with a dangerous pipe dream.

The Democratic Force leaders were interested in establishing that the beachhead in Nicaragua was already in place, a fact borne out by our observations, and that what is going on now is not the beginning but the continuation of a serious war.

"The Bay of Pigs was an invasion on an island and very limited," said Adolfo Calero, a member of the directorate of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force, speaking from his home in Miami. "This [the military action of his organization] goes hundreds of kilometers inside the country. The Sandinistas could not eradicate it."

The leaders of the counterrevolution are frankly puzzled by an U.S. policy that supports them covertly, asks them to die, but through such measures as the Boland amendment in Congress expressly prohibits their ultimate goal of overthrowing the Sandinistas.

Calero attempts to define his group's struggle in terms of the U.S. law. "Some of these people are fighting for their lands, their homes. It's a defensive action, you could say."

But other Democratic Force leaders, speaking privately, are bitter about the ambiguities of their struggles.

"I would like to know where they [the Reagan administration] stand," said one rebel leader instrumental in setting up our trip. "Why must this be a covert thing if they are for us."

"I hate the American approach," he said, sitting in a Central American coffeeshop. "They always talk about body counts and money. They say if you don't behave we won't give you money, that if you don't do well by July we'll have to see what you get between then and November. But we are not money-makers. We are not here for money."

"They don't know what they're going to do, I think. It's like 'put pressure and see what happens. Let's do something here and

see what happens there.' I don't think they have a policy."

This particular Democratic Force leader is one of the most moderate of the counterrevolutionaries and is rumored to be among the potential leaders of any government they might establish. Part of his appeal is his sensitivity to the human issues involved in the war.

"When we are in the States we are not supposed to say we are fighting to overthrow the government of Nicaragua. It's that kind of mental gymnastics," he complained. "Someone says, 'You are not to say you are fighting to overthrow the government of Nicaragua.' You should say you are fighting to democratize Nicaragua."

By opening the war to public view, the leadership of the Nicaraguan counterrevolution hopes that Washington publicly will make a decision one way or another. ●

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JOSEPH D. EARLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1983

● Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with my good friend Congressman PASHAYAN my other colleagues here, and all Armenian Americans to publicly recall and emphasize the terrible atrocities that were inflicted upon the Armenian people by the Ottoman Turks between 1915 and 1923. During these years one of the worst examples of man's inhumanity to man in world history occurred when more than 1½ million Armenians died as a result of Turkish oppression and more than 500,000 were driven into exile from their homes in the Ottoman Empire.

For no substantiated reasons an edict of deportation against Armenians was officially issued on May 27, 1915. Very quickly thereafter hundreds of thousands of Armenians throughout the Ottoman Empire were seized for deportation. The able men were routinely separated from the various groups and taken away to be massacred. The remaining women, children, and elderly were put under a forced march of constant and extraordinary hardships across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia to the Syrian desert. Along the way the great majority of the exiles were either kidnaped, killed by brigands, or died of starvation, disease, and exposure. Meanwhile, most of the Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested and either killed or exiled. All of this apparent planning and execution of the torture, exile, and extermination of the entire Armenian population has been characterized by many authorities as the first genocide of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker the primary purpose in our public expression of outrage today is to try to insure in every way that we can that such a horrible chapter in

world history will never be repeated. By memorializing this barbarous conduct of unprincipled government leaders we remind ourselves and still free peoples everywhere that such tragedies do happen in this uncertain world and that they could happen to any one of us if we fail to be vigilant against them.

Therefore when any people are seen to be threatened by such suppression we should pledge ourselves to take combined representations and action to prevent it. That is the only practical manner by which we can maintain our separate and common freedom and independence against ungodly terrorism and tyranny: It is the only way we can preserve and strengthen our own civilized world.

A further reason for our assembly here today, Mr. Speaker, is to recognize and salute the demonstrated heroic character and spirit of the Armenian people. From my lifelong experience with Armenian Americans as good-willed neighbors, hard-working associates, loyal friends and steadfast patriots I can well understand that their unbending spirit could never be erased by any kind of barbaric cruelty or attempted extermination. In their homeland their people have been subjected over several centuries to many terrible and repeated persecutions, injustices, and sufferings. In spite of these excruciating trials the Armenian people have perseveringly retained their renowned courage and their hopes and beliefs and faith in the Almighty. With these enduring virtues we can all remain confident that they will one day regain their full independence and liberty to everlastingly continue to carry out their destiny as a Christian people and nation. I take heart and courage from their inspiring example. That is why I am very glad to cooperate in the wholesome objectives of our Armenian Americans on this special occasion. ●

RIISING COST OF NATURAL GAS

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, I joined other members of the Populist Caucus in testifying before the Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels in support of H.R. 2154, the Natural Gas Consumer Relief Act. My constituents in the 17th District of Illinois are extremely concerned over the rising cost of natural gas, and I would like to share my remarks with our colleagues in order to emphasize the importance of arriving at a constructive solution to this problem.

My testimony follows:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and my colleague, Mr. Harkin, for taking the time to arrange this opportunity for members of the Populist Caucus to testify before the Subcommittee this morning. As a member of the Caucus, I am pleased that the Subcommittee has agreed to hear the views of all interested parties in the natural gas debate, including those which the Caucus seeks to represent, namely, the average American.

The average American doesn't believe that the Congress really knows or cares how much money he spends on his gas bills. All he knows is that his home heating bill keeps going up at the same time the newspapers are telling him that there's a glut of natural gas on the market. He also knows that turning his thermostat down 10 degrees won't make a dent in his gas bill. He is frustrated, confused and angry, and I don't blame him.

Gas producers, pipelines and distribution companies can all afford to pay Congress to listen to their opinions on the natural gas debate. The average American is simply lucky to be able to pay for his monthly gas bill.

The Populist Caucus was organized to help remedy this situation. Our membership is small, but we are committed to helping the common man have his voice heard in Washington. Hopefully, his voice is being heard today.

These copies of hundreds of consumers' gas bills are a vivid reminder of their deep concern over the natural gas issue. Among this stack are copies of bills from farmers in Illinois, who depend on natural gas in a number of ways to grow their crops or raise their livestock. There are copies of bills from small businessmen, whose slim profit margins are being stretched to the limit from high utility bills. And, finally, there are bills from those average Americans—from families with small children to senior citizens trying to make ends meet on a fixed income—who want to know the answer to just one question: What is Congress doing about the high price of gas?

President Reagan's answer to that question can be put in one word: decontrol. From all the letters I've received from my constituents, this proposal makes about as much sense as wearing white shoes in a barnyard. Common people using common sense know that decontrol is nonsense.

The President is correct in his belief that changes must be made to the Natural Gas Policy Act to help solve the current problems in the natural gas market. But he is dead wrong in assuming that decontrol will mean control in this type of market. Decontrol leaves the fate of the American consumer in the hands of the producer—the same producer who is more interested in making profits for its stockholders than addressing the concerns of consumers.

For residential consumers of natural gas, there is no choice in the marketplace. A household must be heated by gas provided by the nearest utility company—at the rate set by that company from the price charged by the producer—or not at all. Commercial users may have more of an option in choosing their source of fuel—gas, oil or electricity—but making the transition from gas to an alternate energy source is often extremely costly and can cause unacceptable delays in the company's production of goods and services.

The only reasonable solution to this problem is to enact constructive legislation which gives producers adequate incentives to develop sufficient supplies of natural gas

at a price which is fair and truly reflective of the marketplace. I strongly believe that H.R. 2154 will accomplish this goal.

Natural gas consumers in my district have watched their home heating bills increase by a staggering 252 percent since 1978. They have insulated their homes and lowered their thermostats, yet their bills continue to rise. After all this, they must not be left open to suffer the consequences of natural gas decontrol.

Again, my sincere thanks for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on this most important issue. ●

ETHICS AND BUSINESS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun in its March 27 edition, had an interesting article entitled "Ethics Code Becoming Standard for Business," and I think it is worthy of repeating in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it points out the advances that have been made in the field of ethics in recent years and particularly in business. Like all other things which represent advances in human behavior, this advancement is indeed the result of dedicated Americans who set out to make a better situation and are achieving it. The article reads as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 27, 1983]

ETHICS CODES BECOMING STANDARD FOR BUSINESS

(By Brian Sullam)

When McCormick & Co.'s senior executives decided last year to ask all its management officials to sign an annual ethics statement, the Baltimore seasoning and specialty food company joined a large number of American firms that already have instituted codes of ethics.

"Most of the Fortune 500 companies have such codes or policies in effect," said Henry W. Tulloch, executive director of the Center for the Study of Applied Ethics at the University of Virginia. "We have heard of a lot of companies adopting ethics codes, but we have yet to hear of one who dropped it."

A 1979 survey by the Ethics Resource Center, of Washington, revealed that nearly three-fourths of all companies have written codes of ethics for their management, officials, and that nearly half of those had been developed since 1975.

Until recently, ethics was not a pressing topic for senior management.

It was only after the revelations in the mid-1970s that many executives of American's largest corporations knowingly made illegal campaign contributions to President Richard M. Nixon's 1972 reelection effort and the disclosures that many of the same companies were bribing foreign officials that corporate America began to think seriously about business ethics.

Companies were worried not only about their tarnished images, but also that the federal government might increase its regulation of business.

Nor were the nation's businessmen troubled only by the well-publicized cases.

A 1981 report by the Center for the Study of Applied Ethics pointed to a staggering amount of white-collar crime in the United States.

The report quoted Congress' Joint Economic Committee as estimating that crimes like embezzlement, bribery, stock manipulation and antitrust violations cost Americans about \$44 billion a year, 10 times the losses from robbery, burglary and larceny.

"To the extent that various institutions in our nation have failed to earn and keep the trust of the public, we have created regulations that are designed to serve in place of this trust," said Robert Krikorian, chairman and chief executive of Rexnord, Inc., in a speech last fall.

"I firmly believe that regulations has occurred because the public has perceived a need that was not being met and turned to government for help."

Corporate officials concede that it is clearly in their self-interest to develop codes of ethics rather than have the government impose standards of conduct.

"As much as it bothers me to say it, the behavior of some business people invites government to subject us all to heavy-handed regulation," Mr. Krikorian said. "I'm deeply troubled when I read or learn of shoddy or unsafe products, of arrogant disregard for the public interest, of price-fixing, bribery and other violations of the law."

In the case of McCormick, the company wanted to ensure that there would be no repetition of the embarrassing disclosure that the company's Grocery Products Division inflated its sales and earnings, which ultimately required the company to restate its earnings between 1977 and 1981.

Harry K. Wells, McCormick's chairman, told stockholders at the company's annual meeting, "We are proud of our tradition of forthright reporting and ethical business conduct, and these matters do reflect well on that record. We have instituted additional control measures and are dedicated to taking every action necessary to assure that problems of these sort will not occur again."

Many corporate codes of ethics clearly state that the company will cooperate with federal and state law enforcement agencies in the event of criminal violations.

Despite companies' apparent concern that their employees obey the law, a 1980 survey by the Ethics Resource Center revealed that only 7 percent of them saw the ethics code providing them with legal protection should an employee commit a violation.

Most of the respondents present felt the benefits of the codes were to increase employees' pride and loyalty (74 percent) and public good will (66 percent). In addition, 66 percent felt codes of ethics would reduce employee theft.

Most senior executives will say they have codes of ethics in order to prevent employee corruption, but Gary Edwards, executive director of the Ethics Resource Center, noted that many of the codes also have been used to state a company's values.

"We have seen this need develop particularly in conglomerates that have profit centers spread all over the country and the world," he said. "These statements provide a philosophical coherence for managers who do not have daily face-to-face contact with senior management."

He noted that Borg-Warner Corporation, a Chicago manufacturer, recently issued a statement of principles outlining the purpose of the company and the kind of business behavior it expects from its management.

Daniel McElwreath, manager of training and development for Allied Corporation, said his company's program was designed to let its managers know the company has an ethical concern.

"Our presumption is that people want to do the right thing," Mr. McElwreath said. "Often they are confronted with making a choice between two 'right' decisions. For example, do this and satisfy the customer or do this and satisfy the company."

He said Allied wants to let its people know that they can discuss these kinds of considerations comfortably with other employees. "We want people to recognize the ethical dimensions of business decision," he said.

Mr. Tulloch noted that these "values" are important, particularly when a company is putting pressure on its managers to improve their quarterly earnings performance.

Hyman Krieger, a staff member at the Ethics Resource Center, said such impersonal techniques as management by objective "put a great deal of countervailing pressure" on line managers to focus only on performance.

"It is not just a matter of getting it done, but how you get it done," Mr. Tulloch said, adding that how something is done can also affect profits.

As an example, he cited the case of a General Motors assembly plant where the managers gradually increased the speed of the assembly line over a long period of time without telling anyone.

Output at the plant increased, but gradually the employees noticed they could not keep up with the line. They filed a grievance and eventually won a multimillion-dollar settlement for back pay.

"It is not enough to have your employees sign an ethics statement," said Mr. Edwards. "Companies have to create a climate that moves them beyond the bare minimum of obeying the law."

He noted that most tough ethical questions are "ambiguous and difficult," and that the organization ultimately can't straitjacket the decision-making powers of its managers.

Allied Corporation's three-day seminars for its managers center on cases that the employees themselves develop, as well as other well-known cases.

"They might involve questions like 'When should I let the employees know we are going to shut this plant down,'" Mr. McElwreath said. "Or 'Should I promote the loyal employee who has been here for 30 years or the newcomer who appears to have a lot of potential.'"

Rexnord has developed a videotape presentation for its employees that includes a segment in which the company's general counsel discusses the devastating impact that a trial for a white-collar crime can have on a person's career and personal life.

Merely imposing codes of ethics on employees does not necessarily mean that the company's employees will adhere to its terms.

"There has to be an indication that the top management is interested in it," Mr. Tulloch noted. "If it is just another piece of paper to sign, it could very well end up in the wastepaper basket."

Mr. Edwards, of the Ethics Resource Center, pointed to the need to ensure that an ethics program will take root in a company given the continual management turnover.

"You have to have structural mechanisms to ensure that the impact will continue beyond any change in leadership," he said.

Mr. Krikorian, of Rexnord, said his company has told its employees to "walk away from business if it means doing anything unethical or illegal."

"Operating ethically makes it easier to do business," he said. "For that matter, it results in more business. People want to buy from ethical companies." ●

URGE IMMEDIATE ACTION ON BEHALF OF IOSIF BEGUN

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in sending letters to Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin and to Party Secretary Andropov to immediately release Dr. Iosif Begun.

On November 6, 1982, Iosif Begun was arrested for the third time since he first applied for permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel 12 years ago. Begun has been formally charged under Soviet code 70, accused of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, a charge carrying a maximum of 12 years, 7 years hard labor plus 5 years internal exile. He awaits his trial date which is expected to be within the next 2 weeks. Congressional action must be taken immediately.

Dr. Begun, a mathematician, was born and raised in Moscow. He lost his job when he applied to emigrate in 1971 and has worked at numerous unskilled jobs since then. He has been fired from each job because he is a Hebrew teacher in his spare time and has given private lessons to Soviet Jews who wish to learn the Hebrew language.

After his first arrest, he endured 2 years in Siberian exile. As soon as he returned to Moscow, he was rearrested and sentenced to internal exile for 3 years. He served this second sentence, and after finding a job as a fireman in Strunino, he was again arrested last November for teaching Hebrew. At 51 years of age, a 12-year sentence of hard labor could end Dr. Begun's life, certainly any chance of ever escaping the Soviet system. Dr. Begun has become a symbol of the fight for basic freedoms in the Soviet Union. It is imperative that we join together to show our commitment to his cause.

It is clear that Iosif Begun is being persecuted for one reason only—he is a Jew dedicated to maintaining his religious and cultural identity and helping others who wish to do so. The serious crisis in Soviet Jewish emigration has been compounded by increasing restrictions on any kind of Jewish cultural activity, including Jewish literature, and prohibiting the manufacture or import of religious items for holi-

day observances. Iosif Begun's treatment is an example of this anti-Semitic campaign.

We believe that if enough pressure is placed on the Soviet officials before Begun's trial we can affect his sentence. However, once his trial begins all hope may be lost. We must act now.

Recently, the Senate sent similar letters with 98 signatures. I am hopeful that at least in this important case we can have all 435 Members of the Congress join together in showing our deep concern with the religious persecution of Dr. Iosif Begun.

The members of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus join me in calling upon your commitment to the principles of human dignity and freedom and urge you to join us in an effort to help Dr. Iosif Begun.●

**UNDER SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY AMBROSE ON THE
HOL-
OCAUST**

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 1983, Under Secretary of the Army James R. Ambrose, representing the Secretary of the Army, gave remarks at the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors Wreath Laying Ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery. The grave of Army PFC. James J. King who died in the Normandy Invasion, was selected by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council to receive the wreath to symbolically honor all American soldiers who gave their lives in the effort to defeat Nazism. Mr. Ambrose's remarks at the commemoration remind us all of our responsibilities to the cause of freedom:

REMARKS OF MR. AMBROSE

We stand before the gravesite of Private First class James J. King, an American soldier killed during the invasion of Normandy. Private King was chosen at random to represent the thousands who died at the start of the assault to wrest Europe from the Nazi Tyranny.

We are moved to commemorate this event this week because it was also the beginning of the downfall of the perpetrators of the Jewish holocaust.

Tragically, our Army of Private King and his comrades were not in time to rescue the millions already consumed in that holocaust.

But it is the nature of Americans—their origins, their way of life, and their institutions—to reject uncompromisingly the attitudes and offensive conduct which gave rise to that terrible tragedy within a tragedy.

We demonstrated that by arming and marching against the Nazi hordes to free Europe.

Here, as the mute markers in this cemetery solemnly testify, there is testimony that man has courage—alone and together. Here there is no need to compare one man's

deed against another's. Here the overwhelming aura surrounding us is that good men will act individually and together in just cause.

This ceremony today in this resting place of those who have given the ultimate gift in the cause of freedom for all men—is testimony that:

All of the just causes which have brought these brave soldiers to rest here are common causes in the pursuit of justice and freedom for mankind.

Intolerance, fascism, totalitarianism in any form must and will be resisted.

Freedom is a hard fought cause that never ends.

Private King and his comrades are vital reminders to all of us that the cause continues. The terrifying, horrifying holocaust must not be allowed to recur. We must be forever vigilant to that.●

WEST SIDE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize an outstanding educational institution in my district, the West Side Christian School of Grand Rapids, Mich. This school, believed to be the fourth oldest Christian school in the country, is celebrating its 100th year of operation this year. The school has a distinguished history of fine education and dedication to the teaching of Christian principles.

In 1882, the leaders of the Alpine Avenue Christian Reformed Church urged the congregation to open a school to serve the educational needs of the children. To that end, a one room schoolhouse known simply as the Dutch school was opened in 1883. Just 1 year later at a special congregational meeting, it was decided that a larger structure would be needed to accommodate all the students. As a newsletter of the time stated: "and to assure that it would be done, the good people voted to set aside \$100 to \$150 just for that purpose!"

Since that time the physical placement and buildings of the school have altered dramatically to fit the expanding needs of the students. Presently there are two separate buildings housing the kindergarten through middle-school classes, with an addition now being constructed to furnish an additional eight classrooms.

One of the most unique features of the school is that it provides this high quality of education without government assistance. A committee conducts a fund raiser each year, and those funds combined with tuition cover the costs of running the school.

To celebrate this centennial occasion, West Side is publishing a history in the form of a large yearbook. In addition there will be a school-wide pageant in May, in which everyone of the

school's 635 students will participate. Then, in the fall, two large celebrations are planned.

Once again, I would like to salute the West Side Christian School on its 100th anniversary.●

**CRAZY ASSUMPTIONS AND THE
MX MISSILE**

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 1983, there appeared in the Opinion section of the Washington Post a piece by Associate Editor Robert Kaiser entitled "Crazy Assumptions and the MX." Mr. Kaiser's essay cogently describes the crazy quilt history of the MX and its progression of basing modes. He astutely analyzes the folly of the weapon and its search for a home. With the recent release of the Presidential Commission's report on the MX and its recommendation for placing the missile in hardened silos, I think it is important that we in the Congress look closely at the practicality of the MX and its latest basing mode. For this reason, I commend Mr. Kaiser's piece to my colleagues.

**CRAZY ASSUMPTIONS AND THE MX—HOW
WILL WE EXPLAIN THIS NUTTINESS TO OUR
GRANDCHILDREN?**

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

A concerned citizen would be forgiven for wondering what the hell is going on with the MX missile. We seem to have been battling it around for years without any resolution. Now—is this possible?—a definitive decision seems near. Either we are about to get the biggest missile we've ever built—a missile that will carry 10 individually targetable hydrogen bombs up to 8,000 miles with pinpoint accuracy—or we're going to give up on it.

The odyssey of the MX is a mind-numbing tale, and a lot of Americans must have tuned out many chapters ago. But the effort to keep up is rewarding, for by now this amounts to a fundamental lesson in the bizarre relationship between the United States and modern superweapons. The saga of the MX produces insights, even if it fails to produce a more secure America.

It is important to realize at the outset that different players in the MX drama look at the problem in very different ways. No one can understand this debate without knowing something about the participants' predilections. As sociologist Louis Wirth once wrote, the most important thing you need to know about a man is what he takes for granted.

The Air Force has long seen MX as a logical improvement in its arsenal—a supermissile that gives the United States a capability that only the Soviet now have.

Since the 1950s the Air Force has tried to get as close as it can to a "first strike capability"—which means the apparent ability to launch a first strike that would so debilitate the Russians that they would be too intimidated even to try to respond. The Air Force

wants rockets with greater accuracy, so the Soviet will feel that even their most protected ("hardened") targets would be at risk in a war. Predictable Air Force interest in a new model missile has kept the MX alive for years.

President Reagan and his allies are interested in the MX less for specific military purposes than for the impression it would make as part of a concerted buildup of U.S. military power. Politicians assume that nuclear weapons will never be used, but that they have to be acquired to preserve peace. Reagan is a master of symbolism, and he clearly appreciates the symbolic significance of this missile monster. It's proof that the United States is serious about matching Soviet capabilities.

On the other hand, Reagan was determined not to use the MX plan that Jimmy Carter came up with—apparently just because it was Carter's.

Others who support the idea of buying an MX don't subscribe to Reagan's view that the United States has fallen dangerously behind the Russians, but do agree on the importance of symbols in the arms race. This view was clearly stated by Lloyd N. Cutler, a "counselor" to President Reagan's MX commission and former legal counsel to President Carter.

"You've got to do something" to improve the U.S. arsenal in response to the Soviet buildup, Cutler said in an interview. Abandoning MX now "is just an irresolute thing to do," and would send exactly the wrong signal about American resolve to Moscow and to our allies.

Among the opponents of MX there are also many points of view. Advocates of a bilateral nuclear freeze argue that America does not need any new weapons, provided the Soviets stop acquiring new ones. Others will argue that new weapons programs now in view—particularly the "Stealth" bomber that is supposed to be nearly invisible to Soviet radar, and an advanced submarine missile called Trident II that will be about as accurate and powerful as the MX—are more than adequate to impress the Soviets and counter their buildup. Still others will argue that the latest idea for basing MXs—putting them in the existing silos built for Minuteman intercontinental missiles in the 1960s—is so wrongheaded that the missile isn't worth the \$15 billion to \$20 billion it will cost.

But behind these many points of view is one basic question: How can we best preserve nuclear peace while protecting American interests?

The back-and-forth about symbolism, national will and so on only obscures the heart of the matter, which is "deterrence." Deterrence is a simple idea: It means the ability to convince the other guy that launching a nuclear attack would be suicidal.

The Soviets are deterred from attacking us because they know for certain that if they did, their own country would be destroyed.

The push for an MX missile has always been justified on the ground that it would enhance deterrence. But does deterrence need enhancing? Are we in any danger that the Russians might conclude that they could attack—or threaten to—without risking the survival of the Soviet Union?

Comes now the famous "window of vulnerability." Future historians will marvel at this one. After knocking around in strategic journals for years, it came into prominence in the late '70s, promoted by hardliners who were looking for arguments against the

SALT II treaty negotiated by Jimmy Carter. According to the drafty-window theory, when the Soviets deployed enough accurate warheads on their best land-based missiles to be able to target at least two of them against every American rocket that sits in silos in the Midwest and West (that is, about one fourth of America's total arsenal), the United States would become vulnerable to a lightning Soviet attack that could wipe out those American ICBMs. After such an attack, the American president would face a horrible dilemma: to strike back, knowing this would then bring a follow-up Soviet attack on all American cities, or to cry uncle.

Think about that for a moment. The drafty-window crowd was arguing that an American president would accept an attack of at least 2,000 hydrogen bombs on U.S. territory and respond by crying uncle, even though he retained three-fourths of the American nuclear arsenal—enough weapons on bombers and submarines to reduce the Soviet Union to radiant rubble. They were also arguing that some Soviet leadership would risk the survival of the U.S.S.R. on the calculation that this is what would happen.

The theory of the window of vulnerability had more wrong with it than that. It also assumed that the Soviets would risk their country's survival on an attack that had never been—could never be—practiced, and that would require the most stunning technological coordination and the perfect performance of hundreds of Soviet missiles. As former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger—another counselor to the MX commission—put it last week, "The Soviets can never have a high degree of confidence" that such an attack would work. Never.

But the window of vulnerability had a wonderful quality for the strategic thinkers. It was "theoretically possible," and for those who accept the responsibility for preserving America against all nuclear dangers, no matter how far-fetched, that's cause enough for concern. Moreover, this theoretical Soviet advantage created the appearance—the "perception," to use the strategists' favorite word—that the United States might be at a disadvantage. In some future, unspecified crisis, the Soviets might exploit this appearance to "blackmail" the United States. (Here again you need an American president who will cry uncle—who will succumb to blackmail even though he retains a devastating retaliatory arsenal.)

Anyhow, the window of vulnerability became the issue of "Minuteman vulnerability." Minuteman is the solid-fueled intercontinental missile that we began deploying in the '60s. It's a formidable weapon, and we now have 1,000 of them. But if it was theoretically becoming "vulnerable," it could no longer be relied upon. This became the main rationale for the MX.

The rationale depended not on the missile itself, but on where it was put—on its "basing mode." Many Air Force officers really just wanted the MX for its destructive power, and particularly for its ability to destroy Soviet missiles inside their silos, but the politicians needed to be able to claim it was invulnerable to justify spending billions on MX. So the idea was to find a way to hide it from the Russians. The Pentagon came up with dozens of ideas for hiding it—underground trenches, airplanes, racetracks, dense packs and so on. Unfortunately, none could pass both political and technological muster.

Comes now the latest Reagan commission, blue-ribbon panel formed to save the MX

after Congress voted against the administration's last basing idea, the dense pack deployment (lots of missiles clustered close together so that attacking Soviet missiles would destroy each other, not our MXs).

The important fact, apparently undisputed by any participant, is that the commission was formed to save the MX. Conversations with several commission members and counselors confirm that the group began its work with a common sense that it had to find a new, politically acceptable rationale for the weapon.

Why? Because members of the commission shared the assumption that it would be politically and diplomatically disastrous to abandon the MX at this late stage, after spending \$5 billion on it and talking about it for so long.

Harold Brown, Jimmy Carter's secretary of defense and a counselor to the commission, put it with great clarity (and not a little absurdity) last week. If the United States fails to deploy the MX, Brown said, "it would be the first nuclear strategic defeat for any country since World War II." Thus has symbolic politics assumed gargantuan proportions in this debate. You almost expect to hear Henry Kissinger explain again why we must keep investing in the Vietnam war, since we've put so much into it already.

Starting with that perception of a symbolic imperative, the commission set about rationalizing MX. It recommended putting 100 MXs into existing silos now filled with older Minuteman missiles. It recommended redirecting the entire course of arms control negotiations in a way that would undermine the SALT II treaty and President Reagan's initial position in the current negotiations. It recommended constructing a new, mobile missile that could scurry around the country side, thus confounding Soviet targeters.

It is understandable that men like Harold Brown and Gen. Brent Scowcroft, chairman of the MX commission, believe that it is now too late—for symbolic political reasons—to abandon the MX. It is understandable that others will agree, perhaps even including a majority in Congress. Those who do agree will find the commission's report just what the doctor ordered.

But there is certainly another way of looking at it. If the commission's report succeeds as a political document, it flunks as a piece of analysis. Judged on its internal merits, it turns out as it probably had to, as a plausible fraud.

The Scowcroft commission decided, mercifully, to bury the window of vulnerability—it had to, in order to recommend putting 100 MXs into those theoretically vulnerable Minuteman silos in Montana and North Dakota. You can't recommend spending \$15 billion on a turkey. So the report contains some good analysis explaining why the Soviets won't try a sneak attack on all our land-based forces.

But wait. The commission also resurrects the theory of vulnerability to justify the construction of new "midgetman" missile, a smallish rocket that could be transported about on a blast-resistant truck of some kind so the Russians couldn't target it. This would "permit flexibility in basing for better long-term survivability."

Members of the Commission apparently realized there's a contradiction here, so they threw in another argument for the midgetman—it would be useful in case the Soviets figure out how to locate and attack our missile submarines at sea, which are the really invulnerable part of our forces. Is this re-

motely likely? No, but it is theoretically possible. Remember that one?

You might notice that neither of these arguments in favor of midgetman offers any support whatsoever for deploying MXs in Minuteman silos, which is the commission's main recommendation. You may notice that, but the commission apparently didn't.

The commission also says it would be desirable to have a mobile little missile "to reduce target value." This strategists' lingo means it would be desirable not to put so many eggs in one basket that in a crisis, the Russians might be unable to resist the temptation to attack a juicy basket. A lot of little rockets carrying one warhead each offer a less appealing target than a few giant ones each carrying 10 bombs.

Good thinking. But the Commission suspended it before coming to its recommendation to put MXs into Minuteman silos. That's because MXs in Minuteman silos are the juiciest individual targets the United States has ever offered to Soviet missile marksmen. (The commission may have felt that the U.S. should offer the Soviets both high- and low-value targets, of course.)

This matter of creating irresistible targets worries a lot of experts, including some Air Force commanders. Their concern is that the existence of juicy targets in vulnerable holes would tend to put more of a hair-trigger on both nations' arsenals.

A reporter asked Scowcroft and his colleagues about this at their press conference last week. Here, according to the transcript, is how they answered:

General SCOWCROFT. "I don't know—Jim, why don't you comment on that."

JAMES WOOLSEY (undersecretary of the Navy in the Carter administration). "Let Jim—"

JAMES SCHLESINGER. "You wanted that—"

WOOLSEY. "Go ahead, go ahead."

SCHLESINGER. "All yours."

SCOWCROFT. "Trying to share the wealth here [laughter]."

At which point Woolsey jumped back in and changed the subject. The question was never answered.

There are some other problems with the MX commission's reasoning. It blithely declares, for example, that deploying 100 MXs would "remove" or "neutralize" the Soviet advantage in super accurate land-based missiles, though Moscow would still have five times as many warheads as we in this category. Questioned about this assertion, James Woolsey backed away from the commission terminology. "Redress" would be a better word than "remove" or "neutralize," he said. Woolsey was the principal draftsman of the report.

Imagine a Soviet leader's reaction to American deployment of 100 MXs. Is he likely to say, "The Americans are only going to let us have a 5-to-1 advantage in super-missiles—we can't stand for it"? Fat chance.

It seems much more likely that the Soviets have understood from the beginning that all arguments based on the theory of the vulnerability of land-based missiles are silly. Does it make sense that the Soviets would keep putting so much money and effort into that part of their missile arsenal if they expected that the Americans could "neutralize" it? No, the Russians understand better than we do that no sane commander will ever voluntarily risk a full-scale attack in the hope the other side won't retaliate.

The line of reasoning employed by the Scowcroft commission effectively turns over to the Kremlin the right to decide on the

shape and size of American nuclear forces. The commission acknowledges this, albeit indirectly, by adopting the theory that we must be able to match every apparent Soviet capability, whether or not that capability appears to have genuine utility as a deterrent or in war.

Here's how the commission put it: "If comparative military trends were to point toward their [the Soviets] becoming superior to the West in each of a number of military areas, they might consider themselves able to raise the risks in a crisis in a manner that could not be matched."

What do those last words mean? Gibberish. If we have to match every adversary's ability to increase the danger of a crisis, then we have totally lost control over our own affairs. The real aim has to be to acquire enough weapons to assure that deterrence still works. Deterrence is all that will save us from nuclear war, and the definition of deterrence cannot change every time the Russians add another 100 warheads.

Well, that isn't universally accepted. James Woolsey thinks that "delays in deployment [of new weapons systems] indirectly weaken your deterrent somewhat." We have to keep deploying new weapons. Or only a continuing arms race provides safety.

That may sound nutty, but it has actually been the governing ethos of American policy for decades. Is it finally time to stop?

Freeze advocates say yes, but you don't have to favor a freeze to reject the recommendations of the Scowcroft commission. There are plausible alternatives to its program of MX deployments, midgetman development and a whole new approach to negotiating with the Russians. The alternatives are both symbolic and tangible.

Symbolically, the notion that we have failed to respond to the Soviet buildup is largely a figment of the American imagination. To believe that we have done nothing in recent years, all you have to ignore is the Mark 12A warhead that has made 300 Minutemen almost as accurate as the MX will be; the new cruise missile technology, which promises to make Soviet territory vulnerable to bomber attack for years to come; the B1 bomber now in production and the radar-evading Stealth in development; the deployment of the new submarine-based supermissile and its giant launching pad, the Trident I; the decision to deploy new missiles in Europe that can strike Soviet territory; the construction of three new nuclear-powered carriers whose fighter-bombers can strike Soviet territory; and the Trident II missile which promises to give the United States the power and accuracy of the MX by the end of this decade.

A president who found the voice to boast of all those accomplishments instead of publicly declaring American inferiority could reverse the symbolic political equation with alacrity.

More tangibly, there is a perfectly plausible program that will meet any conceivable Soviet threat, provide inducements for Soviet negotiators, and protect American vital interests. It would consist of preserving the Minuteman force of land-based missiles (which would require modernizing them as time passes); proceeding with development of the Trident II missile while emphasizing to the Soviets that it can be bought off with the right kind of arms control deal; proceeding with development and deployment of B1s, cruise missiles and Stealth bombers; and perhaps adopting one of the Scowcroft commission's minor proposals by investing now in development of a new mini-submarine that could carry Trident missiles.

All those steps are expensive and would show how tough we are. All of them can be justified without reverting to political mumbo-jumbo.●

REV. FREDERICK G. SAMPSON,
PASTOR, DETROIT'S TABERNA-
CLE MISSIONARY BAPTIST
CHURCH

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederick G. Sampson is pastor of the Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church in the city of Detroit, one of the city's leading congregations. He grew up in Louisville, Ky., where his father was a minister. He excelled in theological study, earning degrees at Howard University and his doctorate in divinity from the Virginia Theological Seminary. An national and international scholar and lecturer at numerous colleges and universities, Dr. Sampson recently published a book entitled, "The Romance of Theology in the Black Experience."

Reverend Sampson exemplifies many extraordinary traits of intellect and character. He is devoted to his congregation, the community in which he lives and works, and the city of Detroit, where he serves on a number of boards and commissions. He is down-to-earth and always accessible. He also is an orator of the first rank. But even beyond these qualities, I consider his greatest strength the sense of mission and commitment he has brought to his church in applying the Gospel to everyday life and to the solution of human and community problems. Under his guidance the Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church has become involved in every pressing social issue. His church has reached out to young people and found them work; joined with community groups to improve the quality of housing and public services; and has come to the assistance of families in need.

For his extraordinary leadership and service in the community and the Nation, the Detroit Branch of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs will honor Dr. Sampson this Saturday, April 30, 1983, with a luncheon in Detroit. On that occasion, a proclamation of commendation will be given him, a copy of which I have included in this statement. I am also pleased that Reverend Sampson has been chosen by the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives to serve as a guest chaplain, an occasion I look forward to with great satisfaction. I can think of few other human beings and leaders who so deserve the honors accorded them.

PROCLAMATION OF COMMENDATION

Whereas Dr. Frederick G. Sampson, Pastor of the Tabernacle Missionary Baptist Church located in Detroit, Michigan, is one of our nation's foremost Baptist Ministers, and

Whereas Dr. Sampson is highly respected by his peers throughout the nation and the world for his devotion, leadership, and intellectual achievements: He received his Doctorate of Ministry and Divinity from the Virginia Theological Seminary and a Divinity Degree from Howard University; And, he recently published a book entitled, "The Romance of Theology in the Black Experience"; And, he lectures at several universities and colleges annually, and

Whereas Dr. Sampson has given of himself tirelessly and unstintingly to bring hope, justice, equality, and peace through his active leadership in the Detroit community, the national community, and the international community: He is a Past-President of the Detroit Branch of the NAACP; And, a member of the State of Michigan Civil Rights Commission; And, he serves on the Commission for the International Year of the Child; And, he serves as a member of the Board of Directors of numerous community organizations, and

Whereas The Current Topic Study Club, the Detroit Branch of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, has convened this luncheon on Saturday, April 30, 1983, to honor Dr. Sampson, Therefore be it Resolved That Dr. Frederick G. Sampson be awarded this Proclamation of Commendation in recognition of his extraordinary service to promote Humanitarianism, Peace and Goodwill to all the peoples of the world.●

OUTSTANDING ATHLETIC ACHIEVEMENT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that a young man from Lexington, Mo., placed second in the prestigious Boston Marathon. His name is Ron Tabb who is married to Mary Decker Tabb, a well known track star.

I know the Members of this body join me in extending congratulations on this outstanding athletic achievement.●

A SALUTE TO DR. MURIEL PETIONI

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to your attention a resident of my congressional district who was named citizen of the month in March by one of our community newspapers, the Voice in the Wilderness.

The resident, Dr. Muriel Petioni, received this distinct honor for the valuable contributions she has made to the Harlem community over the past 33 years as one of our most dedicated and hard-working physicians.

In addition to naming her citizen of the month, the Voice in the Wilderness printed a feature article on Dr. Petioni in their March 1983 edition. I join with the Voice in the Wilderness in saluting Dr. Petioni and would like to reprint their article in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The text follows:

[From the Voice in the Wilderness, Mar. 1983]

CARING FOR THE SICK: A HARLEM G.P. FOR 33 YEARS

Dr. Petioni has been a general practitioner in Harlem for thirty-three years, but ever since she came to this African-American capital at age five, an immigrant from Trinidad, she has kept a finger on the pulse of life here.

As a child she was in touch with the times through her father, Dr. Charles Augustus Petioni, who was one of the early U.N.I.A. activists, a close adviser to Marcus Garvey, and acquainted with luminaries of the Harlem Renaissance. In the '30s he picketed on 125th Street alongside Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., to protest the whites-only hiring practices.

Muriel Petioni graduated from Howard University Medical School and did her internship at Harlem Hospital from 1937 to 1939. After a decade working as resident physician at various colleges in the South and Mid-West she returned to Harlem and, one year later, inherited her father's practice when he died in 1951.

It was at this time that the young doctor (also now a wife and mother) found herself once more on the front line of what was happening in Harlem: heroin abuse of epidemic proportions. As had been characteristic of other trends in Harlem—including the positive trends—mainstream America wasn't helping.

"So long as the drug problem was just confined to the Harlem areas," Dr. Petioni explained, "people didn't pay any attention. They thought: 'Who cares about those folks up there? Let them kill themselves.'"

But M. Petioni, M.D., had put up her brass plate on West 131st Street and she wasn't taking it down.

COULD NOT IGNORE PROBLEM

"I'd like to be thought of as community-oriented," she told Voice in the Wilderness. "Anyone who came to my door I just took in. It sounds corny, but I feel I want to help people. Heroin had spread like wildfire among the young people and then there were many looking to get off it. I felt treating these addicts was a thing I had to do—even though I was shivering in my boots."

Because there was almost no hospital facility back then in New York for the detoxification and rehabilitation of addicts, and because few physicians would treat them, addicts from near and far came to Dr. Petioni for help.

"The problem was increasing by leaps and bounds. It was risky to help them because it was frowned upon, and you put yourself in jeopardy because so many needed help. They beat a path to your door once word got out that you would help them," said Dr. Petioni, who treated them with stern coun-

seling and a drug to relieve withdrawal symptoms.

"While it was still confined pretty much to Harlem areas, City agencies, etc., didn't do too much about it," Dr. Petioni explained. "But when people realized it was spreading out to the suburbs and the middle-class population, then they started a lot of programs and funding. Now, thirty years later, the problem is still growing but for anyone who wants help there are programs available."

One such program is the Drug-free Treatment Program run by the New York Council of Smaller Churches at 69 West 128th Street. Dr. Petioni is the consultant physician.

"It is the only drug-free treatment program I know of in the area. It's addict rehabilitation without administering any drugs. I think it is very good because there are many drug abusers who have not taken so much that they should go on methadone. We need drug-free programs like this because some people just need that counseling and group support and can get off drugs on their own," said Dr. Petioni.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Aside from the welfare of her patients, who range from top politicians to ex-junkies, Dr. Petioni is active in her concern for her community and her profession.

"Harlem has always been my home," she says. "This is where my support system is." She is on the board of Inner-City Broadcasting (WBLS-WLIB), which is currently negotiating to buy the Apollo Theatre in Harlem to re-open as a cable TV studio.

"Harlem will always be the capital of Black America," she states with the faith and hope that mark her character.

As an African-American female physician, Dr. Petioni founded in 1974 and is the president of the Susan Smith McKinney Steward Medical Society to serve and support Black women physicians. She is also a member of the Harlem-based Coalition of 100 Black Women and many other professional and community organizations. She is also president of the New York-based Trinidad and Tobago Gyp Organization.

Having spent half a lifetime diagnosing the ailments of all who knocked on her door, Dr. Petioni has some simple words of advice: "Eat properly and get sufficient rest." Of course, if we were all perfectly healthy, Dr. Petioni would be looking for another job, and missing the spiritual reward which comes from helping others in the ways she does so well.●

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1983

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLÉNBERG), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee, a bill to amend the Bilingual Education Act of 1965, contained in title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

He and I share the belief that this bill will make it possible for school dis-

tricts to do a better job in preparing students needing instruction to overcome limited English proficiency for full participation and understanding of what goes on in the classroom. It will also enable the States to improve the quality of bilingual education programs by enhancing the role of the State educational agencies in the review and implementation of local programs and in efforts to build statewide capacity to operate these programs.

One of the key provisions of this legislation acknowledges the current prevailing view that no one method of teaching English to children who were raised speaking another language is necessarily superior in all instances. School districts all over the country, faced with increasing numbers of non-English-speaking students, have experimented with a variety of approaches and have found many that work. They have found that different students, coming from diverse backgrounds and entering school at different ages, often need different approaches. In recognition of this fact, educators are given leeway under this bill to design the instructional approach they decide is most appropriate in meeting the educational needs of the target population.

In addition to authorizing a broadened range of instructional approaches that do not require instruction in the child's native language, these amendments would focus basic grants on building and institutionalizing capacity in the school district to serve limited-English-proficient children after Federal aid has run out. The proposal places a 5-year limit on Federal aid to a district because the Department of Education believes that such a limit will provide incentive for school districts to develop their own capacity.

Under the existing program, we have seen numerous districts receiving Federal support for extended periods of time without improving their capacity to run these programs on their own; 41 percent of title VII grant recipients have received Federal aid for 6 or more years, and we have more than 100 school districts receiving support for 10 or more years. I believe some time limitation is in order, but we should in our deliberations on this legislation consider whether to provide an exception in the event that an overwhelming number of minority-language children move into the school district. Some flexibility to cover these situations may be necessary.

Under the provisions of this bill, priority will be given to projects which propose to serve children whose usual language is not English. By targeting Federal funds in this way, the money will go where it is most needed.

These amendments would also authorize bilingual vocational education activities under the Bilingual Educa-

tion Act. This change would confirm existing administrative and budgetary arrangements. Currently, activities for out-of-school youth and adults are not authorized under the Bilingual Education Act but, rather, under the Vocational Education Act. The program is administered by the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, however, and funds are requested under the bilingual education appropriation. No changes will be made in the types of programs offered or the eligible population.

These proposed amendments would, in my view, streamline the bilingual education program and emphasize development of local and State capacity. They recognize that the prime responsibility for bilingual education rests with the States and school districts and that the Federal role is supplementary and geared to preparing the States and school districts to develop their own capacity to carry on these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to give this proposal serious consideration. I look forward to early hearings in the Education and Labor Committee and the opportunity to learn the reaction to, suggestions for, and opinions about this proposal from individuals and organizations concerned about bilingual education.●

DETERRING CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to amend the United States Code to require mandatory additional sentencing for criminals convicted of using a firearm or any deadly weapon in the commission of a Federal felony. Proposals of this sort have received widespread support by many who feel that it will serve as an effective deterrent for criminal activity.

A recent Supreme Court decision addresses the applicability of the double jeopardy clause of the U.S. Constitution in relation to charges of using a weapon in the commission of a crime. In this case, *Missouri against Hunter*, the Court held that the conviction and sentence for both armed criminal action and first degree robbery in a single trial of the accused is not in violation of the protection guaranteed by the double jeopardy clause of the U.S. Constitution. In earlier cases the Court has said that the Constitution's double jeopardy clause prohibited imposing cumulative punishments for the same crime. However, in this recent case the Court has instead ruled that with respect to cumulative

sentences imposed in a single trial the double jeopardy clause does no more than prevent the sentencing court from prescribing greater punishment than the legislation intended and this is acceptable.

Under my proposal, in addition to the sentence for the felony itself, offenders convicted for the first time and found using a firearm or other deadly weapon in the commission of that felony will be sentenced to not less than 1 year, nor more than 5 years in prison. In the case of a second conviction, offenders would be incarcerated for a minimum 5 years and a maximum of 10 years. A third time recidivist would be sentenced to life. In addition an offender under this bill would be ineligible for either parole or probation, nor would the sentence be allowed to run concurrently with another prison term.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize the significant role this legislation can play in deterring criminal behavior and urge their support for this proposal.●

GEORGE O. SKUHR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has dedicated his career to maintaining excellence in the manufacture of American aircraft.

Mr. George O. Skuhr from the Overlea-Fullerton area of Baltimore County will celebrate his retirement at a dinner this Thursday night. Since 1939, Mr. Skuhr has worked in the field of quality control for Baltimore firms which manufacture aircraft. He spent 29 years working for Martin Marietta in Middle River, Md., taking a year off to serve in the U.S. Army Air Corps in 1945. For the past 15 years, he has worked as a quality assurance engineer for the Westinghouse Electric Corp. in Hunt Valley, Md. In his work in quality control, he has kept watch over every aspect of aircraft production, from design to manufacture, to insure the greatest possible safety, efficiency, and effectiveness. He has always maintained a high standard of excellence in his work. He has been knowledgeable and thorough as well as helpful to his younger coworkers.

Mr. Skuhr's dedication to service has also extended beyond his career. Always very civic minded, he serves on the Boy Scout Troop Committee at his church, Epiphany Lutheran, as well as on the church council and his neighborhood improvement association. He is also a member of the senior drum corps of the Baltimore Forest of Tall

Cedars as well as a member of the Mt. Nebo Masonic Lodge.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Skuhr a happy and fulfilling retirement.●

JERRY SOLOMON SUPPORTS U.S. BID TO END SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the massive buildup of Soviet and Cuban arms in Central America. The duly elected Government of El Salvador is under seige. Yet to hear critics speak, Ronald Reagan, our most principled President in decades, is an international outlaw for attempting to stop the Nicaraguan Government from exporting revolution. And his hands are being tied as he attempts to buttress El Salvador with essential military and economic aid.

In an editorial entitled "Endangered Bastions," columnist William Randolph Hearst warns of this buildup of arms, and proposes a way to protect the Salvadoran Government. I submit his editorial for the RECORD, and recommend it to my colleagues.

[Text of editorial "Endangered Bastions" follows:]

ENDANGERED BASTIONS II

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—The Soviet-Cuban plot to gain control of El Salvador was hatched in the late 1970s. In February 1979, U.S. intelligence sources received reports that the first group of Salvadoran guerrillas had arrived in Cuba for a four-month military and ideological training course. Since then, many more have been sent to Cuba for training.

According to a report by the Council for Inter-American Security, the plan for a leftist takeover in El Salvador was submitted to communists and guerrilla leaders from 10 Caribbean and Central American countries at a secret meeting in Costa Rica in December 1979.

By early 1980, Cuban President Fidel Castro had organized the rival leftist groups in El Salvador into a united front to launch a civil war.

In May 1980, Shafik Handal, head of the Salvadoran Communist Party, flew from Havana to Moscow and thence to Vietnam where he met with Communist Party chief Le Duan. The latter promised 60 tons of arms (mostly captured American weapons) and large supplies of ammunition. On his return trip, Handal visited Czechoslovakia and East Germany.

An American Heritage Foundation report said "fully documented evidence" shows that the Soviet-Cuban bloc communist nations pledged nearly 800 tons of modern weapons for leftist revolutionary movements in the Caribbean and Central America, with El Salvador to be the main target

for the campaign "to destabilize the Central American region."

Undersecretary of Defense Fred Ikle told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week that during 1981-82, the Soviet Union alone had shipped a total of 131 tons of arms to Cuba. Most of the weapons and munitions were transshipped to Nicaragua to be smuggled by air into El Salvador.

Ikle said the military strength the Soviets and Cubans have assembled in Central America "is quite adequate to turn the region into another Eastern Europe" if the United States washes its hands of the conflict.

It must be evident to anyone aware of this situation that we cannot tolerate the establishment of other Soviet military outposts on our southern doorstep. Central America and the Caribbean island countries are strategically more important to us than Cuba.

We must not let the situation reach the point where we will be confronted with the choice of sending our young men to fight in Central America or abandoning the region to Soviet control.

That is why I believe the time has come for a new approach to the problem, especially since there is so much doubt about the ability of the Salvadoran army to defeat the guerrillas in the foreseeable future.

It is generally agreed by American officials and others closely associated with events in El Salvador that the majority of the Salvadoran people would vote for a moderate, centrist-oriented government if given the opportunity to do so in free, well-protected elections.

It is further believed the three non-Marxist leftist parties in the revolutionary movement would desert the extremists and participate in elections, as they did last year.

My suggestions, therefore, are the following:

A strong Latin-American peacekeeping force, with American logistic support but no combat troops, be sent to El Salvador to maintain order before, during and, for a reasonable period, after the elections.

The elections be held under the close supervision of a commission of competent observers appointed by the Organization of American States.

We join with other Latin American governments in pledging a five-year economic aid program to El Salvador if a moderate, democratically elected government is established after the elections.

I believe such a plan would be given serious consideration by the Reagan administration. I believe the existing government of El Salvador could be persuaded to accept it. There are some well-informed people in Washington who think several Latin American nations would be willing to help form the peacekeeping force.

If the plan worked, it would serve notice to the Kremlin that it will not succeed in expanding communist domination in the Western Hemisphere by arming and inciting minority radical elements to seize power as surrogates of Soviet imperialism.

President Reagan's televised speech Wednesday night gave proof positive of the massive Soviet military buildup in Central America and the Caribbean region. The air reconnaissance photographs he declassified were a telling revelation of what the Soviets are up to in Cuba, Nicaragua and other key regions the Russians seek to penetrate.

The President went personally before the nation—always his best act—to pinpoint with the aerial photos what the Soviets have been amassing in offensive power even

in the tiny island of Grenada, which has a population of 110,000 and no air force.

His presentation included an appeal for a bigger military budget than the one adopted by House Democrats. It also covered a proposal by which the U.S. can harness its technology to clock incoming nuclear missiles similar to those the Russians store in areas of the Caribbean and Central America.

The Soviet reaction to his speech was nearly instantaneous, a rarity for the regime now headed by Yuri Andropov. It called President Reagan's remarks "bellikose" ("warlike" by dictionary definition), but the Soviets didn't comment at all on the photos the President showed the nation of the real "warlike" Russian buildup south of our borders. What could they say?

Building up American strength to counter this real Soviet threat needs our support for which the President asks.

It's a lot later than you think.●

BILL INTRODUCED TO AMEND THE AUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I join with four of my distinguished colleagues in introducing a bill to amend the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere Act of 1977 to authorize appropriations to carry out the provisions of the act for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The administration is requesting a zero funding level for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. This bill would provide \$630,000 for fiscal year 1984 and \$630,000 for fiscal year 1985.

The National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA) consists of 18 members who are appointed by the President for their knowledge and expertise in marine and atmospheric policy matters. The advisory committee is charged with the responsibility to undertake a continuing review of the Nation's oceanic and atmospheric programs, to report annually to the President and Congress on the status of U.S. marine and atmospheric activities, to advise the Secretary of Commerce regarding programs of NOAA, and to provide any other reports on these matters that are commissioned by either the President or Congress.

In previous Congresses, members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and other Members of Congress have called upon NACOA to provide recommendations on issues pending before Congress. In light of recent budget constraints, the advisory committee's role is even more vital than in the past.

I am confident that the advisory committee will continue to aid the executive branch and Congress as effectively as in the past and I urge my colleagues to support reauthorization of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere.●

SEX DISCRIMINATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that discrimination on the basis of sex no longer occurs in this country. There are those who say that women already enjoy equality and there is no need for the equal rights amendment. They simply do not see the discrimination on the basis of sex which is all around them.

For those people, I have included the April 17, 1983, Washington Post article by Richard Cohen. This article discusses the tax subsidies enjoyed by Burning Tree County Club in Bethesda, Md., a club that will not allow members of the female gender.

Burning Tree is not the only such club in the country to enjoy women's tax dollars while refusing admittance to women. In addition, Burning Tree is merely a blazing example of the inequities that women must continue to suffer because their elected officials refuse to act to eliminate those inequities.

The article follows:

BURNING BIAS

(By Richard Cohen)

From time to time, I remember back to the civil rights era when the Mississippi legislature voted to donate money to the White Citizen's Council, a racist organization. There was a lot wrong with that, but what struck me as adding insult to injury was the fact that some of the money would be coming from black taxpayers. When it came to funding segregation, Mississippi did not mind integration at all.

Now we go to a less cosmic, and to some, downright humorous issue—Burning Tree Club in Bethesda. It has been an all-male preserve since its founding in 1923, and for many years it was smugly so. Now it is sort of reluctantly so—the arguments for continuing the policy running more to the expense of putting in another shower room. It is enough to make you weep.

Nevertheless, in the spirit of the Mississippi legislature, the gentlemen of Burning Tree are not above asking women to subsidize the club.

In other words, women who are not permitted to join the club, who may not— heaven forbid and may God strike me dead—even enter the premises, are nevertheless required to make a tiny contribution to the upkeep of the club. It is the law.

The law in question is called the country club assessment tax. Under it, Maryland's country clubs are taxed at a favorable rate,

the rationale for this being that they provide a public service—open space.

This is, of course, a specious argument, since the open space is provided only to people who can afford the initiation fee (\$12,000 to frolic in Burning Tree's open space) and the annual dues (\$1,700 at Burning Tree), and who, moreover, can stomach a confrontation with the chief justice of the United States decked out in lime green and shocking pink.

Nevertheless, this is the law of Maryland. For Burning Tree, this means that what would be a tax assessment of \$165,600 is reduced (for providing inner-city kids with open space) to \$13,600. This is called in the country club biz a nice piece of change without which, we are told, Burning Tree would have to raise its dues so that it would become a rich man's club—and presumably have to withdraw from a bowling league.

At this point, you should be gagging on hypocrisy. Not only is Burning Tree already a rich man's club, it is one supported by all the people of Maryland, most of whom would not possibly be considered for, and could not afford, membership. But only the people specifically barred from membership on the basis of what they are at birth are—women. Rich or poor, it does not matter: Women need not apply.

Now we may pause right here and practice the fine art of blaming the victim. In this case, though, the victim—women and men who care about sexual discrimination—really do deserve some blame.

Year after year the Maryland General Assembly treats them with contempt on Burning Tree, and year after year the opponents of the measure to eliminate the club's tax break get reelected. It is inconceivable that someone could vote to have the state support a club that banned blacks or Jews or Catholics and be reelected—especially if half the electorate were black or Jewish or Catholic. Women, though, still allow themselves to get kicked around. They are the battered electorate.

And battered they were again this year. When the General Assembly was asked to eliminate the tax break to clubs that discriminate, it got tied up into procedural knots and just could not bring itself to do it. Some members of the legislature were opposed, of course, while even more, it seemed, considered this a trivial issue. G'way lady, ya bother me.

Well, in some ways it is a trivial issue. Large amounts of money are not at stake and large numbers of people would not be affected even if the club went to hell with itself and admitted women. But as a matter of principle, the issue is not trivial at all.

It is, like Mississippi's donation to the White Citizen's Council, an example of government representing just some of the people and compelling the others to support their own victimization. That has nothing to do with golf or open spaces. It has to do, instead, with fairness. In Maryland, that's sometimes as scarce as women at Burning Tree.●

NATIONAL ART BANK

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as we look around this Chamber, around

this Capitol Building, we can see how the presence of many works of art has enhanced our lives.

It is hard to imagine this building without murals or without statues. It would be barren indeed.

So it is that I have introduced H.R. 2030, the National Art Bank Act of 1983, which will serve the twin purposes of carrying on the traditions established in these Halls by enhancing the appearance of some rather drab Federal office buildings around the country, while at the same time helping to stimulate activity in the arts community in all 50 States, a community in need of help in these recession-ridden times.

The arts have always been a legitimate interest of this Government, even if on a modest scale. Our creation of the National Endowment for the Arts testifies to this.

And our history shows that statesmen who helped found this country were interested in nurturing the arts, and were aware of their importance.

John Adams, President, Vice President and Congressman, said:

I must study politics and war, that my sons may have the liberty to study mathematics and philosophy . . . to give their children the right to study painting, poetry and music.

As you look around many of the Federal buildings in this city, Mr. Speaker, you can see the fruits of a depression-era Government support for the arts. The murals defined a particularly American expression, and are a reminder for the ages of what life was like here in the 1930's.

The philosophy of John Adams and the support of the Works Progress Administration in the 1930's form the basis of what we are trying to do with this bill.

The Art Bank would become the intermediary by which works of art from all over the country would be purchased and made available for display, not only in Federal buildings, but in special loan exhibitions as well. Museums could receive works on loan and free of charge from the Art Bank.

There many artists from around the country who do extraordinary work, but are limited in their ability to bring their work to the attention of the public. There are many public places which sorely need some art work to enhance their ambiance, but which have no way of obtaining it.

The Art Bank would purchase art, distribute it, and then, at a later date, auction it off, thus stimulating activity for artists. The program would not be a profitmaking venture but we would expect that after a modest expenditure of seed money it would be self-financing. The bill authorizes \$1.5 million for fiscal year 1984, \$2 million for fiscal year 1985, and \$3 million for

fiscal year 1986, after which no more Federal money would be needed.

There is every expectation that as the works purchased become more valuable, the proceeds from the auctions would be able to support the program. We believe the appropriations provided for in the bill are a modest cost to begin such a worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, the quality of the work would be the prime consideration for purchase, but also of importance would be the selection of works by unknown artists from all parts of the country.

A companion bill, S. 882, has been introduced in the Senate by Senators PELL and STAFFORD.

This bill has the capacity to brighten the lives of millions of people in all 50 States, to improve the appearance of Federal buildings in all 50 States and to provide incentives to artists in all 50 States.

All of that would be accomplished with a small initial expenditure of funds, after which the program would support itself.

The National Art Bank would be an exciting, worthwhile and innovative program for this Government to undertake, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in helping to create it.●

**BRUCE G. COE HONORED BY
SALES EXECUTIVE CLUB**

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today the Sales Executive Club (SEC) is presenting its New Jersey Business Statesman of the Year Award to Bruce G. Coe, the president of the New Jersey Business and Industry Association (BIA). He is receiving the award in recognition of the contributions he has made to the business community. I have known Bruce for many years and am privileged to be able to bring his accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues.

Bruce was chosen to receive the award by SEC because of:

His achievements in business and the time and energies he has given to causes and events extending beyond the immediate interests of BIA. His enlightened perspectives and enthusiastic labors for various organizations and public-spirited groups have been of benefit to the entire business community and the state.

I would like to take this opportunity to outline some of Bruce's accomplishments. Before becoming president of BIA, he had agreed, at the request of the Governor, attorney general, and treasurer of New Jersey, to head the Housing Finance Agency. At the time he assumed responsibility for the management of the Housing Finance

Agency it was being investigated by three governmental agencies. His management skills enabled him to pull the agency out of its decline so that it is today able to fulfill its goal of providing housing assistance to low- and moderate-income families.

An illustrious 20-year career with Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc. began in 1956 after Bruce graduated from Princeton University with an economics degree. While with Kidder, Peabody & Co., he worked in its corporate finance activity and corporate syndicate group, as well as national sales manager for 5 years. Bruce was elected to the company's board of directors in 1965 and to the executive committee. As chairman of the institutional task force, he set up a real estate subsidiary and headed a research group in investment banking activities.

Bruce left Kidder, Peabody & Co. to become executive director of the New Jersey Commission on Capital Budgeting and Planning, which was formed in an effort to find out why New Jersey's bond issues were unsuccessful in public referendums. The commission was also charged with the responsibility of developing a system that would allow New Jersey's bonds to be more credible and to monitor funds authorized to be spent by the voters. Bruce's leadership of the commission resulted in such a great improvement that our State is now very successful in having bond issues approved by the voters.

Bruce has also made numerous public service contributions at the county and local level. From 1970 to 1982 he was active with the Monmouth Medical Center as a trustee and vice chairman of the finance committee and from 1976 to 1982 he worked with Monmouth County Organization for Social Services as a trustee and treasurer. He is also a past president and trustee of Rumson Community Appeal and a former treasurer and director of the Red Bank YMCA. In addition, he has been active with the Monmouth County Mental Health Association and presently serves on the New Jersey Easter Seal Society Board of Directors.

His college career was interrupted from 1951 to 1954 while he served a 4-year term with the U.S. Army as a first lieutenant in the armored corps.

I am proud of Bruce Coe and the contributions and service he has provided to my State of New Jersey and I ask that you join me in honoring him as an example of an outstanding business and community leader. He is highly worthy of the award he is receiving today.●

HOPEFUL SIGNS IN LOUISVILLE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives an article published in the April 20, 1983, edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Signs of the Recovery Finally Hit Louisville, But Not All Feel Effect."

As the article indicates, the good people of Louisville (my hometown) and Jefferson County, Ky.—the Third Congressional District I am proud to represent in Congress—have begun to pull themselves out from the current economic hard times.

While my district still has serious economic difficulties confronting it, the recent signs of recovery are a tribute to the dedication, initiative and plain hard work of the people of Louisville. I am proud of their spirit and I am honored to serve them in Congress.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 20, 1983]

**SIGNS OF THE RECOVERY FINALLY HIT
LOUISVILLE, BUT NOT ALL FEEL EFFECT**

(By Laurie McGinley)

LOUISVILLE, Ky.—In their modest brick home a few miles north of here, Vivian and Jerry Plamp are beginning to enjoy life again.

They recently bought a \$100 mirror for the living room, and they plan to buy a \$1,200 pool table for their newly finished basement. They have started going out to dinner again on Friday nights, and their 11-year-old son, Donald, is sporting some new clothes.

Having been laid off by a trucking company for six months, Mr. Plamp, 29 years old, now is back delivering Ford trucks to dealers and customers around the country. "I feel like things are starting to swing up," he says.

Others here agree. Real-estate sellers and car dealers, as well as some home builders and retailers, say that a fragile economic recovery is getting under way in this recession-pounded manufacturing city in the heart of the Ohio River valley.

MANY KEEP WAITING

But many are still waiting for the recovery to begin. Roger Bright, whose general contracting business plunged last year to \$7 million from \$24 million in 1981, says that his business has leveled off but hasn't improved. He expects some pickup by June or July, if interest rates don't rise.

For thousands here, the recovery may never arrive. George Berkley is one of 5,000 workers laid off during the recession by General Electric Co., the area's largest employer, currently employing 13,500 workers. The 55-year-old Mr. Berkley, who has been out of work more than a year, often eats potato soup for supper to stretch his meager unemployment pay. "I just pray that GE gets a lot of orders and I get called back," he says.

But officials at the gigantic factory at Appliance Park say that most laid-off workers won't be called back, even if orders surge. One reason: The company plans to install more robots, which already make one kind of dishwasher. "We'll produce more goods with fewer workers," says Roger Schipke, the top executive at the plant. "It's the factory of the future."

The mixed economic picture is typical of many cities. "The recovery is very narrowly based and limited right now," says Allen Sinai, senior vice president of Data Resources Inc., a Lexington, Mass., consulting firm. "Many consumers and businesses in Louisville and elsewhere won't feel any relief until late this year." And that assumes the recovery won't stall.

END OF THE LAYOFFS

Like the severe 18-month recession that apparently ended late last year or early this year, the recovery is extremely uneven. In Louisville, lower interest rates have spurred home sales and auto sales. A three-year string of plant closings and layoffs appears to be over. There have been a few scattered worker callbacks. But unemployment remains at a painfully high 11.7% and is expected to stay in double digits all year. Consumers, while loosening their purse strings a bit, still are cautious.

Perhaps even more troubling in such manufacturing strongholds are the deep-rooted problems that even an economic recovery won't solve. Since its peak in 1974, factory employment in Louisville has declined by 40,000 jobs, about one-third of the previous total. About 18,000 of those jobs disappeared during the recent recession. Most will never return. The permanent changes in the economy have set off a debate here over whether the city should try to shore up its traditional industries or start an all-out effort to attract more service and high-tech businesses.

Despite recent hard times, the service industries clearly seem to be thriving. Profit at Louisville-based Humana Inc., the nation's second-largest hospital chain, rose 37% last fiscal year. At Capital Holding Corp., which owns seven insurance firms throughout the U.S., net income increased 11% last year. Citizens Fidelity Bank, the city's second-biggest bank, expects a 17% earnings increase this year.

SERVICE SPUR

The strong service sector may be one reason that Louisville is feeling at least some benefits of the nation's economic recovery. "For white-collar workers, this recession has been pretty good," says Phillip Douglas, a 25-year-old certified public accountant with Coopers & Lybrand. He notes that "inflation and interest rates have come down."

Mortgage rates, which had peaked at 18% here, have declined to the 12% to 13% range. While still high by historical standards, the rates are luring some buyers back into the housing market. On a recent weekend, Glynn Dunn, a real-estate saleswoman for Paul Semonin Inc., the area's largest real-estate firm, sold three homes and began sales negotiations on two others.

"I can't remember when I've had such a good weekend," she says. The Louisville Board of Realtors says that 1,271 homes were sold in the first three months of this year, almost a 40% increase from the year before.

Car sales are picking up more strongly here than the modest national gains. First-quarter sales, bolstered by below-market fi-

nancing rates, were up 28% from a year earlier, a local dealers' group estimates. Morris Brown, the owner of Brown Brothers Cadillac in downtown Louisville, says he sold 136 new Cadillacs in March, his highest monthly total in eight years. At Bill Collins Ford, March sales were the best in "two or three years," says Charles Oglesby, the general sales manager. He says many of his customers are GE workers who were waiting to buy a car until they were sure they wouldn't be laid off.

David Grissom, the chairman of Citizens Fidelity Corp., the bank-holding company that owns Citizens Fidelity Bank, sees other encouraging signs: Delinquencies on consumer-installment loans are down from a year ago and business-loan demand is up. "I think our customers are becoming more optimistic all the time," he says.

Lawrence Smith, the president of Rodes Inc., a men's clothing store, says he has seen a significant increase in sales since November. "My salesmen are very pleased," he says. "I think a recovery is definitely under way here."

But other retailers aren't so sure. "I haven't seen an increase in sales," says Terry Rogers, who owns three record shops called Beethoven's House of Music. When customers come in to buy a newly issued record by pop singer Christopher Cross, he says, "they buy a Chris Cross record, period. It used to be that they'd try something new, too." And Robert Hook, a Chevrolet dealer, says that his sales are only matching year-ago levels after rising 15% in the November-to-January period.

Some residents say they are too worried about their jobs to increase their spending. "I don't have enough confidence to go into debt," says Paul Garrett, 45, who has worked at General Electric for 24 years. "I don't take vacations anymore. I raise green beans and I can them. I bought a used car—I don't buy anything new."

Nettie Aynes, a 44-year-old widow and mother, is anxious, too. Mrs. Aynes, who works on the day shift at GE putting chrome trim on refrigerators, lost her \$65 night differential when the night shift was eliminated last August. She hopes that a recovery means she will get her old job back, or at least be more secure in her current job. "All people talk about around here is, when will the next layoff be? The end of this month? The end of next month?"

In fact, General Electric says it doesn't plan to lay off any more workers this year, partly because appliance sales have begun to improve. Since last October, unit sales on a monthly basis have been higher than in year-ago periods. Company officials won't disclose the precise figures, but the industry's total sales for the kinds of appliances produced here were 8% higher in the first two months of this year than a year before. GE officials say their sales are "in line" with the industry figures.

GE'S EMPLOYMENT

But there won't be many more jobs at the GE plant, where employment has plunged to the current 13,500 workers from a peak of 23,000 a decade ago. In the past 10 years, the national demand for major appliances, excluding microwave ovens, has fallen by about one-third. Responding to community worries that GE might move out, as several other major industries have done in recent years, plant officials replied succinctly: "GE will stay in Louisville, but it won't stay the same."

Ford Motor Co., which has two truck plants here, also is having a mixed experi-

ence. The plant that makes the Ranger and the new Bronco II—both light trucks designed to fight models of Toyota and Datsun—has a three-week order backlog, the largest since the Ranger was introduced in January 1982. The Bronco II was unveiled a year later. But orders haven't picked up yet at the plant where school buses, tractor-trailers and other big trucks are made.

Plant managers say neither factory is likely to increase its work force this year, and next year might not be any better. The combined work force currently is about half its peak of 10,000 in the late 1970's. "If we need to step up production, we'll lengthen the workweek" by adding overtime, says Donald Baker, the plant manager of the Ranger plant.

The gloomy job outlook has doused much of the hostility that usually has surrounded labor-management relations here. Labor unions, smarting from what they contend is an undeserved reputation as strike-mongers, have agreed to no-strike clauses in three major construction projects and have even taken out ads in local newspaper praising certain employers.

WHERE THE FUTURE LIES

Many labor and manufacturing officials, though, are split with community leaders over whether Louisville's future is with service and high-tech industries instead of manufacturing.

"If by service jobs you mean auto workers should start cleaning up parking lots, frying hamburgers and working in hotels for half of what they're making now, I have real problems with that," says Owen Hammons, an official of the United Auto Workers here. James Whyte, the manager of the Ford big-truck plant, says, "High tech isn't the solution. Atari showed us that." His reference is to Atari Inc.'s recent decision to move its consumer-electronics production from California to the Far East.

Others see salvation in the service industries, however. "The only growth in Louisville in recent years has been in the service industries," says Thomas Simon, the chairman of Capital Holding Co. "That's the way of the future."

Several of the service industries are helping to bring a downtown building boom. Planners say that \$358 million was spent on downtown construction projects between 1968 and 1978; by 1985, an additional \$585 million will have been poured into downtown building. Next month, work will begin on the Broadway Project, a 10-year plan to revitalize the tattered northern end of downtown by renovating an old hotel and building a new shopping and restaurant area.

The service sector's growth in Louisville, though, hasn't been enough to make a dent in the city's unemployment problem. Since 1978, the city has lost five manufacturing jobs for each new service job, according to David Birch, a regional planning specialist at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In some ways, analysts say, Louisville and some other Southern manufacturing cities are in even tougher spots than their Northern counterparts because of a lower emphasis on education in their states. Compared with other major metropolitan areas, Mr. Birch says, Louisville has workers who rank near the bottom in education levels, making it difficult for them to switch to more sophisticated jobs involving computers and high technology. Indeed, one local company hired 50 computer programmers from Eng-

land partly because it couldn't find qualified people in Louisville.

"People in Louisville thought they had it made when they started stealing the low-tech industries from the Northeast in the 1960s," says Mr. Birch, who was hired by a local bank to study the city's economic problems. "But the entire U.S. economy now is moving from one based on muscles and dexterity to one based on brains. In 10 years, there's a good chance that the industries based on muscles won't be here. But the industries based on brains will have tripled."

Some city officials say that Louisville should try to capitalize on its central location by becoming a national transportation and distribution center. Others say the city should continue to develop its medical facilities. But, everyone admits, any step away from manufacturing will require extensive retraining of the work force.

Such efforts will depend to some extent on the strength of the recovery and what kinds of jobs it generates. "We'll play some role in retraining, once we can figure out what to retrain people for," says GE's Mr. Schipke. Former GE worker George Berkley says, "I'd be happy to retrain, if someone would just let me go back to work." ●

TITLES 31 AND 49 AMENDMENTS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to codify without substantive change recent laws related to money and finance and transportation, and to improve the United States Code. This bill will amend titles 31 and 49, United States Code, that have been enacted into positive law, to reflect changes in the substance of those titles by laws that did not specifically amend those titles and to make conforming amendments to certain titles of the United States Code that have been enacted into positive law and to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

The bill makes no change in the substance of existing law.

This bill was prepared by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives and submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House under section 285b of title 2, United States Code.

Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of the bill and accompanying report should contact: Edward F. Willett, Jr., Law Revision Counsel, House of Representatives, H2-304, House Annex No. 2, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Persons wishing to comment on the bill should submit those comments to the Office of the Law Revision Counsel not later than June 1, 1983. ●

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, we have just concluded the observing of National Library Week, and this is a good a time as any to associate myself—and proudly—with the efforts of my friend PAUL SIMON of Illinois to reauthorize the Library Services and Construction Act.

It is well known that we live an electronic age, and, as I speak these words, I am conscious that they will first be transmitted via television and only later will settle into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where they can be read, and dissected, or pored over, and psychoanalyzed, or whatever.

And there is the great charm of the written word—you can learn from it. There are many modes of human communication, but it is reading which develops the mind as it carries the thought. And it is the public library in America which has served as gymnasium to such heroic intellects as Booker T. Washington, and Thomas A. Edison, and so many others. These days the computer is in the library, along with the book—and sitting in a public library somewhere right now may be the great prodigy of our next generation. ●

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, some of the most serious violations of human rights are those inflicted upon human rights monitors themselves in various countries around the world. From El Salvador to Czechoslovakia, brave men and women who collect information about human rights violations and report it to the outside world are subject to persecution themselves.

The U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee was formed by a group of concerned American citizens to monitor the compliance of those nations which signed the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. The group continues the work of the original Moscow Helsinki Watch Committee, many of whose members are exiled or imprisoned.

The following article by Jeri Laber, the executive director of Helsinki Watch, describes her recent visit to Czechoslovakia, where she had planned to meet with Helsinki monitors there. I commend it to the attention of the Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1983]

THROWN OUT OF PRAGUE FOR VISITING ERIKA

(By Jeri Laber)

I am afraid that I shall never see Erika again. The authorities in Czechoslovakia have put an end to our friendship, the friendship of two women, one a Czech citizen living in Prague, the other an occasional visitor from the United States.

They did this with chilling efficiency a few hours after my arrival, telling me that because I was "making contact with dissidents and Charter people" I must "leave the territory of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia immediately" or I would have "great problems."

Erika (not her real name) was the only person I had seen so far in Prague and she is, admittedly, a "Charter person." Six years ago she signed a document known as Charter 77 which called on the Czechoslovak government to honor the human rights of its citizens.

More than 1,000 citizens in Czechoslovakia signed the Charter and each of them has paid a price for that act. Charter signatories have lost their jobs, their homes, their driver's licenses, their telephones. Their children are denied entrance to universities. They live under strict police surveillance—of their movement, their conversations, their mail.

Some have been attacked and beaten up in the streets; others have been arrested and are serving long prison sentences. Many have been forced into exile.

As recently as Jan. 5, one of the current spokespersons for Charter 77, Ladislav Lis, was arrested and reportedly is being held on trumped-up charges. Yet the Charter signers do not consider themselves dissidents. As a Charter spokesman told me during a previous visit to Prague, "Dissidents are people who oppose the will of society, while we represent the aspirations of 90 percent of the people. It is our leaders who are the dissidents."

On the first morning of what was intended to be a four-day stay in Prague, I went to see Erika. She seemed much too thin, I thought, smaller than I had remembered her, but fragility also accentuated her wide green eyes and lovely face. Wearing jeans and a loose-fitting shirt, her long, gray-blond hair pulled back into a bun, she was apparently cleaning her house when I appeared at the door. She immediately offered tea in her small kitchen, "real English tea, the best in Prague."

Erika is a recent widow, the mother of three young sons, none of them yet out of their teens. Her husband had been a writer whose controversial works could only be published abroad. Her husband from an earlier marriage, also a writer, now lives in exile in London, stripped of this Czech citizenship while abroad. Her parents, both officials in the Dubcek government during the brief, exciting "Prague Spring," were forced to leave Prague when Soviet troops invaded the city in 1968 and have been living in Paris ever since. She had not seen them for 15 years.

The isolation in which Erika and other Czech intellectuals live is almost tangible; it hangs heavy in their homes and in their words. Deprived of books and ideas from the outside world, ostracized by society, they cling to each other for moral support.

"I never greet anyone from my past when I see them in the street," Erika confided. "I wait to see whether they will say 'Hello' to me or pass by as if we had never met."

She spoke with sadness about the fact that her children will not be allowed to enter college: "They are paying this price for their parents' decisions. That is not fair." She spoke of increasing loneliness as more and more of her friends emigrate to the West. Yet she herself stands firm: "I would love to travel abroad," she said in cultivated, almost unaccented English, "and to live there for a year to two, maybe even 10. But only if I knew that I could come home when I wished. When Christmas comes, I will always want to be in Prague."

Several years ago, Erika and I had set out together to visit the historic Jewish museum and cemetery in the old city, only to realize that it was Saturday and the museum, of course, was closed. It was then that we each discovered that the other was Jewish—and that we both should have known that the museum would be closed on the sabbath. Now reliving our friendship, Erika reminded me with amusement of that abortive visit and suggested that we try again, this time on a weekday. We made a date to do so later that very day.

Several hours later, however, on my way to meet Erika, I was stopped by the police and ordered out of the country. "Go straight to the hotel, pay no visits, pack your things and be over the border by 10 this evening. You are under control."

"Under control" meant that I was then followed openly, no longer covertly, by three plainclothesmen in a yellow, unmarked car. The car stayed close behind me until I had driven at least 30 miles out of Prague. Then, apparently convinced that I was following directions, it turned suddenly and roared away.

The night was clear, the road deserted. A full moon lit the snow-covered fields and gave a slight patina to the thin, icy coating on the highway. I passed through a small village, unchanged by time, quiet as a ghost town, not a person in sight. It was just a few minutes before 10 when I reached the Austrian border.

The barrier that was eventually raised to let me pass into the customs area was made of iron so thick and heavy that no car or truck could crash through. The customs officers are on the lookout for ideas and people, the first to keep out, the second to keep in. When I had entered the day before they had studied my papers, notebooks and address book with great care. Now, as I left, they checked the car itself to see that no one was hidden in the trunk, under the seats or even hanging under the car in a desperate effort to escape.

Along the border, two parallel lines of barbed wire and electrified fencing stretch off to infinity, the lines coming closer but never touching, like an art book illustration of perspective. Between the fences there's a no-man's-land, heavily mined.

Twenty minutes later I would be in an Austrian village, the architectural sister of the Czech village I had just passed through, but full of light and life. There, in a cafe, I would drink beer and eat goulash, the same substantial fare that one finds in Prague. Sounds would be suddenly dear to me: the sounds of laughter and high-spirited conversation that are never heard in a public place in Prague.

At that moment, however, there at the border between East and West, I was looking backward, overwhelmed by sorrow for the friends in Prague that I had not been able to see, for Erika all dressed up for our afternoon's outing, waiting with happy anticipation for a friend who never showed up.

I said a quiet farewell to Prague, that heartbreakingly beautiful city whose hundreds of years of culture and civilization have culminated in a system so absurd and barbaric that I had been afraid, for Erika's sake, to call on the phone, just to say: "I'm sorry. I cannot keep our appointment today."

(Jeri Laber, executive director of Helsinki Watch, has traveled extensively in Eastern Europe. Biographical details in this article have been disguised to prevent identification, but conversations are reported accurately, as is the encounter with the police on Feb. 25, 1983.)

SUPPORT EXTENDED DAYLIGHT SAVINGS

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Representative RICHARD OTTINGER's bill, H.R. 1398, will extend daylight saving time in this country 2 months each year. The bill provides that daylight saving time start on the first Sunday in March and end on the last Sunday in October. A longer daylight saving period would allow more daylight hours for work and recreation, and it would also help this country save energy due to a reduced need for electricity.

Department of Transportation studies have indicated that we could save about 100,000 barrels of oil per day during the extended daylight period. Another benefit of the bill is that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration predicts fewer traffic fatalities per year if the plan is implemented. Longer days could also mean less violence in our Nation's cities and towns.

In my judgment, the facts are compelling and the time is right for the extension of the daylight saving provisions of Representative OTTINGER's bill. I urge all my colleagues to support this measure, which would be of great benefit to our Nation.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information

for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 26, 1983, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 27

8:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Labor; and certain programs of the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on Centers for Disease Control, and the National Institutes of Health.

SD-116

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue oversight hearings to review the current state of and competition within the financial services industry.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 44, to establish uniform standards of product liability law.

SR-253

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on proposed establishment of the National Endowment for Democracy as a private non-profit corporation to be administered by the U.S. Information Agency.

SD-419

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1001, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1988 for the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, and on proposals to revise certain provisions of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act.

SD-485

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to mark up S. 38, proposed Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act Amendments, and S. 655, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1984-86 for the national sea grant college program, and other pending calendar business.

SD-430

Small Business

Small Business: Family Farm Subcommittee

To hold hearings to discuss certain problems facing family farm owners.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

*Appropriations

District of Columbia Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the government of the District of Columbia.

SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for transportation related programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Management and Budget.
S-126, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, on pending calendar business.
SD-366

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on S. 602 and S. 659, bills to provide Federal funding for radio broadcasting to Cuba.
SD-419

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers union (HEREIU).
SD-342

1:30 p.m.
Finance
To resume hearings on S. 307 and S. 951, bills to provide continued health protection for certain individuals who lost their health insurance coverage as a result of being involuntarily unemployed.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the land and water conservation fund, and the asset management program.
SD-192

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

APRIL 28

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

9:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Architect of the Capitol.
S-126, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review certain secondary market and mortgage foreclosure issues.
SD-538

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 485, proposed Lawyers Duty of Disclosure Act.
SD-226

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
SD-124

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, on pending calendar business.
SD-366

Finance
To hold hearings on S. 528, to provide a Federal income tax credit for tuition.
SD-215

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-419

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To continue hearings to investigate alleged involvement of organized crime and mismanagement of funds in the hotel and restaurant workers union (HEREIU).
SD-342

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 815, S. 1059, and the substance of S. 425, bills to provide equal access and opportunity to public school students who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes.
SD-430

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to review the high cost of capital.
2203 Rayburn Building

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings to explore certain Federal court procedures relating to the exclusionary rule, habeas corpus, and related matters.
SD-628

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the government of the District of Columbia.
SD-192

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the strategic petroleum reserve, and the naval petroleum reserves, Department of Energy.
SD-138

*Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the General Services Administration, and to discuss the substance of S. 102, to allow State and local governments to continue to acquire surplus Federal lands for park and recreational use.
SD-124

2:30 p.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nominations of John L. Ryan, of Indiana, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service, and Maria L. Johnson, of Alaska, to be a member of the Merit Systems Protection Board.
SD-342

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 727, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set-aside certain judgment funds of the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, S. 884, to provide for the use and distribution of certain funds awarded the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, and S. 973, to make technical amendments to the Indian Self-Determination Act.
SD-538

APRIL 29

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the National Institutes of Health, and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 73, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary school prayer.
SD-628

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 249, to make permanent and extend the exclusion from income for amounts paid under educational assistance programs, and S. 825, to exclude income from the sale of membership lists from the unrelated business income tax on nonprofit organizations.
SD-215

Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 32 and S. 33, bills to prohibit the owner of certain audiovisual equipment from renting, leasing, or lending for commercial advantage without the authorization of the copyright owner.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Family and Human Services Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1003, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for child abuse prevention and treatment and adoption reform programs, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Domestic Volunteer Service Act.
SD-430

MAY 2

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 622, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake feasibility investigations, S. 662, to provide for confirmation of the repayment contract of the Dallas Creek participating project of the Upper Colorado storage project, S. 805, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Santa Margarita project, Calif., and S. 818, to authorize the replacement of existing pump casings in Robert B. Griffith water project pumping plants 1A and 2A formerly the southern Nevada water project.

SD-138

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs, focusing on nuclear waste activities.

SD-366

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 883 and S. 558, bills to expedite exploration and development of geothermal resources.

SD-562

10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 73, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary school prayer.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Mineral Management Service, Department of the Interior, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

SD-138

MAY 3

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Energy's research and development programs.

SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Legal Services Corporation.

SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 811, proposed Health Care for Displaced Workers Act.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending Calendar business.

SD-226

MAY 4

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation relating to science education.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the government of the District of Columbia.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending Calendar business.

SD-366

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 772, to establish an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health to coordinate Federal and private activities to educate the public about the health hazards of smoking.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the government of the District of Columbia.

SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending Calendar business.

SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider pending Calendar business.

SD-419

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Office of Revenue Sharing (New York City loan program), Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Credit Union Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-419

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 81 and S. 141, bills to revise current law relating to civil actions for the deprivation of rights.

SD-226

MAY 6

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to review financing mechanisms, interim storage, fill capacity, and other related issues.

SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Information Management and Regulatory Affairs Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980.

SD-342

MAY 9

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for refugee programs.

SD-226

MAY 10

8:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of E. Pendleton James, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 999, proposed International Telecommunications Act.

SR-253

- Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on home health care services. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for certain defense related programs, focusing on arms control and military strategy. SD-192
- Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366
- Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-406
- Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-226
- MAY 11
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 999, proposed International Telecommunications Act. SR-232A
- Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on oil pipeline deregulation. SR-253
- Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366
- Governmental Affairs
Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the District of Columbia school system's career oriented curriculum. SD-124
- Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on home health care services. SD-430
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations. SD-226
- MAY 12
- 9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on certain tragedies involving children. SD-562
- Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on computerization of criminal history. SD-226
- Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on S. 772, to establish an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health to coordinate Federal and private activities to educate the public about the health hazards of smoking. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. SD-124
- Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-406
- 2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
*Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1984 for territorial affairs. SD-192
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 81 and S. 141, bills to revise current law relating to civil actions for the deprivation of rights. SD-226
- MAY 13
- 9:30 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 137, to permit the continued issuance of mortgage revenue bonds after December 31, 1983, and S. 1061, to revise certain IRS provisions relating to the tax treatment of bonds that are guaranteed by certain Federal agencies. SD-215
- Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to mark up S. 772, to establish an Interagency Committee on Smoking and Health to coordinate Federal and private activities to educate the public about the health hazards of smoking. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-366
- Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to examine fire safety matters. SD-430
- 10:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
To resume hearings to explore certain Federal court procedures relating to the exclusionary rule, habeas corpus, and related matters. SD-226
- MAY 16
- 9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 610, to encourage college student-athletes to complete their undergraduate education before becoming professional athletes. SD-226
- 10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold hearings to discuss the progress made in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease. SD-430
- MAY 17
- 10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business. SD-226
- 2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1031, S. 970, and S. 865, bills to provide for the operation, maintenance, and construction of national waterways. SD-406
- MAY 18
- 9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the status of emergency preparedness in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. SD-562
- Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters. SD-628
- 2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations. SD-226
- Veterans' Affairs
To continue oversight hearings to review adverse health effects from exposure to agent orange, and other related matters. SD-628
- MAY 19
- 9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on S. 372, to promote interstate commerce by prohibiting discrimination in the writing and selling of insurance contracts. SR-253
- Judiciary
Patents, Copyright and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on computer chips protection. SD-226
- Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on health care cost. SD-430
- 10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 696, to provide for the ratification of the Memorandum of Agreement between the U.S. Department of the Interior and the State of Texas for the Management of the Matagorda Island State Park and Wildlife Management Area A Unit of

April 25, 1983

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

9649

the National Wildlife Refuge System
in Calhoun County, Tex.

SD-406

Judiciary

Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings to discuss bankruptcy
matters relating to the Manville Cor-
poration in Denver, Colo.

SD-562

10:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on the geo-
politics of strategic and critical miner-
als.

SD-366

MAY 20

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the effects of chem-
otherapy in the treatment of cancer.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To resume oversight hearings on orga-
nized crime in the United States.

SD-226

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 10, propos-
ing an amendment to the Constitution
of the United States relative to equal
rights for women and men, and on re-
lated measures.

SD-628

MAY 23

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommit-
tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1984 for certain
programs under the subcommittee's
jurisdiction.

SD-124

MAY 24

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Em-
ployee Retirement Income Security
Act (ERISA).

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommit-
tee

To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1984 for certain
programs under the subcommittee's
jurisdiction.

SD-124

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-226

MAY 25

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the problem of pa-
rental kidnapping.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on health care
cost.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nomina-
tions.

SD-226

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on food safety.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation
providing for certain veterans' com-
pensation.

SR-418

JUNE 9

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on food safety.

SD-430

JUNE 10

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on food safety.

SD-430

JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation
revising certain provisions of the
Labor-Management Reporting and
Disclosure Act, Landrum-Griffin Act.

SD-430

JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Sub-
committee

To resume oversight hearings on activi-
ties of the Patent and Trademark
Office, Department of Commerce.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcom-
mittee

To hold hearings on the proposed Alien
Education Assistance Act.

SD-430

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings to review
certain health care and other services
provided Vietnam veterans.

SR-418

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nomina-
tions.

SD-226

JUNE 16

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on deinstitutionaliza-
tion of certain status offenders.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legisla-
tion revising certain provisions of the

Labor-Management Reporting and
Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act).

SD-430

JUNE 20

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcom-
mittee

To resume hearings on proposed author-
izations for refugee programs.

SD-226

JUNE 22

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Sub-
committee

To hold hearings on patent term resto-
ration.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Family and Human Services Subcommit-
tee

To resume oversight hearings on the
breakdown of the traditional family
unit, focusing on causes and remedies.

SD-430

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on certain
health care services for veterans.

SR-418

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nomina-
tions.

SD-226

JUNE 23

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Family and Human Services Subcommit-
tee

To continue oversight hearings on the
breakdown of the traditional family
unit, focusing on the role of Federal
policy.

SD-430

JUNE 27

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcom-
mittee

To resume hearings on proposed author-
izations for refugee programs.

SD-226

JUNE 29

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Sub-
committee

To hold hearings on Federal Govern-
ment patent policy.

SD-226

10:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to consider proposed
legislation providing for certain veter-
ans' compensation.

SR-418

9650

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

April 25, 1983

JUNE 30

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on juvenile offenders of serious and violent crimes.

SD-226

JULY 6

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

JULY 13

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

JULY 20

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 48, to establish the National Transportation Commission as an independent regulatory agency, and to eliminate existing statutory restrictions against common ownership and control of certain water carriers.

SR-253

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To continue hearings on S. 48, to establish the National Transportation Commission as an independent regulatory agency, and to eliminate existing statutory restrictions against common

ownership and control of certain water carriers.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

To continue hearings on J. 771, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1983-86 for health promotion and disease prevention programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-430

APRIL 29

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 425, to provide equal access and opportunity to public school students who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes.

SD-430

Labor and Human Resources

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Constitution on S. 425, to provide equal access and opportunity to public school students who wish to meet voluntarily for religious purposes.

SD-430